

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JULY, 1880.

ARTICLE I.

HUMAN ORDINANCES IN THE CHURCH.*

By REV. S. A. HOLMAN, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa.

The Fifteenth Article of the Augsburg Confession relates to rites and ordinances of human authority in the Church. The Latin, German and English texts of this article are as follows:

XV. DE RITIBUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

De ritibus ecclesiasticis docent, quod ritus illi servandi sint, qui sine peccato servari possunt, et prosunt ad tranquillitatem et bonum ordinem in ecclesia, sicut certae feriae, festa et similia. De talibus rebus tamen admonentur homines, ne conscientiae onerentur, tanquam talis cultus ad salutem necessarius sit. Admonentur etiam, quod traditiones humanae institutae ad placandum Deum, ad promerendam gratiam, et satisfaciendum pro peccatis adversentur evangelio et doctrinae fidei. Quare vota et traditiones de cibis et diebus etc., institutae ad promerendam gratiam et satisfaciendum pro peccatis inutiles sint et contra evangelium.†.

*Fifteenth Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, on the Holman Foundation, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 12, 1880.

†Müller, Symbolischen Bücher.

XV. VON KIRCHENORDNUNGEN.

Von Kirchenordnung, von Menschen gemacht, lehret man diejenigen halten, so ohne Sünde mögen gehalten werden, und zu Frieden, und zu guter Ordnung in der Kirchen dienen, als gewisse Feier, Festa, und dergleichen. Doch geschieht Unterricht dabei, dasz man die Gewissen nicht damit beschweren soll, als sei solch Ding nöthig zur Seligkeit. Darüber wird gelehret, dasz alle Satzungen und Tradition, von Menschen dazu gemacht, dasz man dadurch Gott versühne, und Gnad verdiene, dem Evangelio und der Lehre vom Glauben an Christum entgegen seind; derhalben sein Klostergelübde und andere Tradition von Unterschied der Speise, Tag, &c., dadurch man vermeint Gnade zu verdienen, und für Sünde gnug zu thun, untüchtig und wider das Evangelium.*

XV. OF ECCLESIASTICAL RITES.

Concerning Ecclesiastical Rites, they teach, that those rites are to be observed which may be observed without sin, and are profitable for tranquillity and good order in the Church; such as are set holidays, feasts and such like. Yet concerning such things, men are to be admonished, that consciences are not to be burdened as if such service were necessary to salvation. They are also to be admonished that human traditions, instituted to propitiate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith. Wherefore vows and traditions concerning foods and days and such like, instituted to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are useless and contrary to the Gospel.†

The term "ecclesiastical rites," is employed in a more restricted sense than is the phrase "Church Ordinances instituted by men," which is derived from the German text. A "rite" conveys the idea of a ceremonial act, an "ordinance," that of an established law relating to any usage or opinion. Hence the topic and the scope of the present lecture may be indicated by the title: *Human Ordinances in the Church.*

*Müller, *Symbolischen Bücher.*

†C. P. Krauth's "Augsburg Confession, literally translated from the original Latin." 1868.

THE DIVINE AND HUMAN FACTORS IN THE CONSTITUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH.

In the seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, it is taught that the Christian Church exists and develops through the administration of ordinances which are of *divine* origin and obligation. "The Church is the congregation of saints, in which the gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered." Those who appropriate the salvation imparted through these external means of grace properly constitute the Church, although "in this life, hypocrites and evil persons are mingled with it." Therefore the primary essential factor in the constitution and development of the Church, is the grace of God, operating through his divinely appointed means. When man becomes the recipient of divine grace he is called to labor together with God in the development of the Church. Human agency, though not coördinate with the divine, is nevertheless an essential factor. As in the sphere of providence, the human must coöperate with the divine, so in the sphere of divine grace there must be a human agency to work together with God. As the divine word was revealed to our race, not immediately to each individual soul, but "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," so now it is necessary that man should administer the means of grace which God provides, in order that the Church may exist and develop on earth. The service of man in mediating salvation through the Church, includes not only the administration of the objective means of grace; it likewise requires the manifestation of his own subjective views and the exercise of his own finite powers. Man, originally created in the image of God, that he might reflect the character and the work of his Creator, lost, in his fall, the ability to realize the great end of his existence; but under the Gospel he is enabled to "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him," and thus regenerated he finds the highest and noblest exercise of his intellect, sensibilities and will, in the development of the visible Church. God has thus put man into a garden of greater glory and value than Eden, "to dress it and to keep it."

NECESSITY OF HUMAN ORDINANCES.

The necessity and the sphere of human ordinances in the Church, especially appear in the consideration that the end of the ceremonial usages of the Old Testament, respecting persons, things, places and times, having been fulfilled by the advent and atonement of Christ, those ordinances are no longer necessary nor binding upon the Church. The dispersion of the Jews, and the destruction of their temple, where it was necessary to administer many of their ceremonial laws, indicate this fact; but it is expressly taught in scripture that "the first covenant had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary, but Christ being come, an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, obtained eternal redemption," Heb. 9:1, 11, 12. To the Christians at Colosse, who were perplexed by the opinion of some that the Church was yet bound by the ceremonial laws of Moses, the apostle writes: "Let no man judge you in meat or drink," cf. Lev. 7:10-27; 10:9; Num. 6:3; "or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ," Col. 2:16. The restrictions upon the freedom of human agency, under the Old Testament, were required by the typical character of the covenant and the low attainments of the chosen people in their apprehension of the divine plan of salvation. The ceremonial ordinances of the Old Testament, like its moral laws, were designed as a schoolmaster to lead to Christ. If numerous specific usages and ceremonial laws had been divinely ordained in the New Testament, as they, were in the Old, the fundamental doctrine of the sufficiency of the atonement of Christ would be greatly obscured. But the abrogation of the ceremonial usages of the Old Testament, and the absence of divinely ordained rites and usages for the regulation of worship, government or discipline, in the New Testament, necessarily require the exercise of the subjective powers of man. All organizations must have modes of existence and forms of development. Hence those who constitute the visible Church, are not only at liberty but under obligation to ordain such rites and usages, as are necessary to formulate its worship, to constitute and administer its government, and to establish

its doctrines. A preliminary principle in the Formula of Government and Discipline of the General Synod is that "as Jesus Christ has left no entire specific form of government and discipline for his Church, it is the duty of every individual church to adopt such regulations as appear to it most consistent with the spirit and precepts of the New Testament and best calculated to subserve the interests of the Church of Christ," Ch. 1, Sec. 5. This principle illustrates the doctrine which is expressed in the first clause of the Fifteenth Article of the Confession, viz.: that "ecclesiastical rites are to be observed." The liberty and obligation of the Church are indeed subject to the higher law of the divine word, which restricts the sphere of the human agency to the institution of such ordinances as "may be observed without sin, and are profitable for tranquillity and good order in the Church." The Apology of the Confession, (VIII.) says, "our adversaries agree to the first part of the Fifteenth Article, in which we say that the ceremonies and ordinances which can be kept conscientiously without sin, and which promote order and tranquillity should be observed in the Church."

DIVERSITY IN THE INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES WHICH REGULATE HUMAN ORDINANCES IN THE CHURCH.

Whilst, however, there is this unanimity of opinion respecting the divine authority of these principles which regulate human ordinances in the Church, we shall presently see, in the consideration of particular human ordinances, how various and discordant are the views of men with regard to their meaning and application. In reference to the principle that human ordinances must be observed without sin, it is indeed manifest and universally admitted in the Church, that in any conflict of authority between divine law and human ordinances, we ought to obey God rather than men; yet there is much diversity of opinion whether human ordinances and usages, which are now established in many portions of the Church, are transgressions of positive precepts or just inferences from the divine word—actual transgression, being "every action, whether external or internal, which conflicts with the law of God."

In like manner we find diversity of views respecting the in-

terpretation and application of the divinely ordained principles of "tranquillity and good order," which also regulate human ordinances in the Church. Concord in the visible Church is enjoined by the divine word: "Be at peace among yourselves," 1 Thess. 5: 14. "Follow peace with all," Heb. 12: 14. But what is peace in the Church? When Christ says: "I came not to send peace, but a sword," Matt. 10: 34, He not only proclaims the irrepressible conflict between truth and error, but He discriminates between a true and a fictitious peace in the Church. Good order is likewise a positive purpose of human ordinances in the Church, according to the divine precept: "Let all things be done decently and in order," 1 Cor. 14: 40. The divine will conforms to this principle which binds the human agency in the development of the Church. "God is not the author of confusion," 1 Cor. 14: 23. Indeed order, as a manifestation of law, pervades the entire government of God. "Order is Heaven's first law." As God has bound the operation of His own power, so has He that of man, to laws, by which all things in heaven and earth are created and controlled. The well known words of Richard Hooker, in the closing paragraph (8) of his first book on "Ecclesiastical Polity," may appropriately be recalled. "Of law there can be no less acknowledged than that her seat is the bosom of God, her voice the harmony of the world. All things in heaven and earth do her homage; the very least as feeling her care and the greatest as not exempted from her power. Both angels and men and creatures of what condition soever, though each in different sort and manner, yet all with uniform consent admiring her as the mother of their peace and joy." But whilst the principle of good order is generally recognized as a divine precept, the protracted and oftentimes violent controversy with respect to various rites and usages of the Church, attests that there is no uniformity of judgment as to the right application of that principle in the cultus of the Church. As the various creeds of Christendom arise, not from any diversity of view respecting the authority of the objective word, but from the diversity of subjective apprehension of the word; so human ordinances in the Church, respecting modes of worship and forms of government,

differ, not because there is no general acceptance of the principles of the supreme authority of the word and its divine precepts enjoining tranquillity and good order in the Church, but because the judgments of men differ in regard to their meaning and application. Our Article, therefore, in the *second place*, exhibits this truth, viz.: that whilst there is an agreement between the confessors and their adversaries, respecting the designation of principles which must regulate human ordinances, yet there is no agreement with the Roman Church, on the one hand, nor with the Reformed Churches, on the other, respecting the interpretation and application of these principles to specific human ordinances in the Church. There is indeed no antithesis, or condemnatory clause to the Fifteenth Article, such as is found in eight of the fourteen preceding articles of the Confession. There is no designation of adversaries, as Romanists or Anabaptists; and Burger in his "Evangelischer Glaube" commenting on this Article, says that "a special antithesis is omitted out of forbearance in the Augustana, because it would only have been pointed against the Papists."* But whilst we can perceive throughout the Confession a studied forbearance to irritate the Romanists, there is no hesitation, in the Fifteenth Article, to condemn the error of any adversary.

ERROR OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

The Fifteenth Article of the Confession, in its truly conservative and scriptural interpretation and application of the principles of the supremacy of the divine word, and of its precepts enjoining tranquillity and good order, in the regulation of human ordinances in the Church, points, not only against the Papists, but anticipates the error of most of the Reformed Churches, which subsequently separated from the Evangelical Confession. In the first place, our Article maintains that "set holidays, feasts, and such like, are to be observed." And in this specific application of the principles which regulate human ordi-

*Eine besondere Antithese ist aber dennoch aus Schonung in der Augustana weggelassen, weil sie nur gegen die Papisten würder gerichtet gewesen sein. Vol. 2, p. 196.

nances, it cannot be said that it "points against the Papists;" for they observe "set holidays, feasts and such like," but, in this respect, it does point against the Anabaptists of the time of the Reformation, and against most of the Reformed Churches which subsequently arose, and which discarded "set holidays, feasts, and such like," on the ground that a right interpretation and application of the principles regulating human ordinances in the Church, did not sanction their observance. This reference to those who, in abandoning the errors of the Romanists in their false interpretation and application of these principles, nevertheless swung to an opposite extreme and discarded also the truly conservative interpretation of the Evangelical Lutheran Confession relative to Church ordinances, "is thus represented by Prof. Zöckler, in his work "Die Augsburgische Confession," p. 256: "The attitude of our Confession, so far as it holds fast to these elements of ritual-tradition—always only in a form determined and purified according to the Scriptures—is opposed to all subjectivism and unchurchly radicalism. It takes a decided position against that iconoclastic zeal and that rude breaking with Christian history which characterizes most Reformed Churches and sects."* He then specifies "the Scottish Presbyterians, as having removed all ecclesiastical festivals except Sunday," and the Zwinglians in Switzerland, as having stricken "churchly anniversaries, except the chief yearly festivals from the calendar, and therewith have banished from the Church, bells, organs, altars, pictures and crucifixes, the customary order of pericopes, and liturgical forms or prayer; all these in supposed following of apostolic example and precept, but in truth moved by a spirit of abstract, unhistorical radicalism, and of an ever-strained zeal, even to an iconoclastic extreme, against real or only imaginary idolatry in the Church."

In the Directory for the public worship of God, which was drawn up by the Westminster Assembly, and accepted by the Church of Scotland in 1645, there is an appendix which declares

*Sie kert sich mit Entschiedenheit gegen jenen bilderstürmerischen Eifer und jenes schroffe Brechen mit der christlichen Geschichte, welches die meisten reformirten Kirchen und Secten characterisirt.

that festival days, vulgarly called holidays, having no warrant in the word of God, are not to be continued; nevertheless it is lawful and necessary upon special emergent occasions, to separate a day or days for public fasting or thanksgiving, as the several eminent and extraordinary dispensations of God's providence shall administer cause and opportunity to his people. Cf. Art. "Festivals," by Rev. J. S. Black, Ency. Brit., 9th ed.

ERROR OF THE ROMAN CHURCH.

But if the Fifteenth Article of the Confession declares against the false interpretation and application of the principles which regulate human ordinances, as represented in the most Reformed Churches, equally decided is its protest against the false interpretation and application of these principles by the Roman Church. Indeed this article illustrates the chief controversy between the Roman and the Evangelical Lutheran Churches. For the Roman Church at the time of the Reformation attached a justifying merit to the observance of human ordinances and traditions, as it does to this day. Therefore according the Evangelical Church, the Roman Church violated the principle, that only such human ordinances should be observed "which may be observed without sin." It is clearly in opposition to the ordinances and usages of the Roman Church that the concluding and greater portion of the Fifteenth Article of the Confession teaches this doctrine, viz.: "men are to be admonished that human traditions instituted to propitiate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith. Wherefore vows and traditions concerning foods and days, and such like, instituted to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are useless and contrary to the Gospel." That the Roman Church teaches justification by works enjoined by human ordinances, as well as by faith in Christ, is manifest from the following canons of the Council of Trent: "If any one saith that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the divine mercy, which remits sins for Christ's sake; or, that this confidence, alone, is that whereby we are justified; let him be anathema." Sess. 14, Can. 12.

"If any one saith that satisfaction for sins, as to their temporal punishment is nowise made to God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, by the punishments inflicted by Him, and patiently borne, or by those enjoined by the priest, nor even by those voluntarily undertaken, by fastings, prayers, alms-deeds, or by other works also of piety; and that therefore the best penance is merely a new life; let him be anathema." Sess. 14, Can. 13.

"If any one saith that the satisfactions by which penitents redeem their sins through Jesus Christ, are not a worship of God, but traditions of men which obscure the doctrines of grace, and the true worship of God, and the benefit itself of the death of Christ; let him be anathema." Sess. 14, Can. 14.

Corresponding to this doctrine of good works, the Roman Church institutes ordinances and usages, such as monastic vows, fastings, difference of meats, observance of days, pilgrimages, penances, indulgences, rosaries, auricular confession, celibacy, extreme unction, worship of saints, etc. That Church maintains that one by such means appeases God and merits grace, and that the observance of these ordinances, from such motives and with such an object, does not in the least contradict the Gospel and the doctrine of faith in Christ. But with such a view of the value of human ordinances, they cannot be observed without sin. The evangelical doctrine as declared in our article, teaches that human "traditions" * * * instituted to merit grace and make satisfaction for sin, are useless and contrary to the Gospel." The Apology of the Confession, (VIII.) characterizes such a view of human ordinances, as "evidently a Jewish principle, in fact a suppression of the Gospel by the doctrine of the devil." Paul condemns it in speaking of those who "being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God," Rom. 10 : 3. Christ rebukes it when he says, "in vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15 : 9. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, is the subject of the fourth article of the Augsburg Confession. The doctrine of good works as the will of God and the fruit of faith, is the subject of the sixth article of the Confession. The doctrine of the relation between

faith and good works, is the subject of the twentieth article. Hence, as the nature and value of good works are thus completely considered in other articles of the Confession, it is not designed in the consideration of our Article to discuss particularly the doctrine of the merit of good works. This doctrine is introduced into the fifteenth article, in order to define the negative aspect of human ordinances in the Church, viz.: that they are not designed to propitiate God, to merit His favor, or to make satisfaction for sins.

POSITIVE DOCTRINE OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

Therefore it is the positive doctrine taught in this article which especially claims our attention, viz.: that human ordinances "are to be observed which may be observed without sin, and are profitable for tranquillity and good order in the Church." The right interpretation and application of these principles to specific human ordinances in the Church have their source, (1), in the science of hermeneutics, with respect to the correct apprehension of the divine word, by which it is determined whether they are observed without sin; (2) to the science of ethics, with respect to the determination of that which is right as the condition of true tranquillity; and (3) to the science of æsthetics with respect to the determination of that which is beautiful, harmonious, and appropriate, as essential elements in the law of good order. Through these sciences the intuitive conceptions or ideas of the human mind, respecting the true, the good and the beautiful, are educated into a correct knowledge of that which is right and wrong in human ordinances. Conceding the right of private judgment to all, and disavowing an absolute infallibility in her own conclusions, the Evangelical Lutheran Church nevertheless holds that she has been educated into a correct understanding and application of the principles which rightly regulate human ordinances in the Church. Her position amid the various subjective views of men, may, on the one hand, be called radical, in opposing the fundamental error of the Roman Church, which attaches a justifying merit to their observance; and, on the other hand, it may be called conservative, in contrast with the unchurchly views and prac-

tices of those Reformed denominations which ascribe to their observance idolatry, superstition, or insignificance.

SPECIFIC HUMAN ORDINANCES.

If we now consider specific human ordinances in the Church, we observe in the Fifteenth Article that mention is made only of "set holidays, feasts, and such like." The Variata, 1540 (42), in place of "feasts and such like," supplies, "certain devotional hymns and other similar rites," (certae cantiones piae et alii similes ritus). The Apology of the Augsburg Confession (VIII.) says: "the three chief festivals, Sunday, and the like, which were established for the sake of order, union and peace, we cheerfully observe." It also mentions a local customary "every Sunday observance of the Lord's Supper;" it regards with special favor the custom of catechisation; it condemns the adversaries for neglecting the preaching of the word in many countries during the whole year, except only in Lent. In the twenty-sixth article of the Augsburg Confession it is said, "many ceremonies and traditions are observed by us, such as Mass [not however in the sense of the Roman Church, but in the sense of necessary ceremonies attending the evangelical administration of the Lord's Supper], singing of hymns, festivals, etc., which are calculated to promote order in the Church." Thus we observe that "holidays and festivals," are prominent in the Confession and its Apology, as human ordinances rightly instituted in the Church. They are prominent because the administration of the means of grace, the public worship of God, and the commemoration of sacred events in the planting of the Christian Church, necessarily require stated times for their observance; and because different opinions existed respecting the nature and necessity of the festivals of the Church.

All specific human ordinances in the Church may, however, be included in the following classification, viz. :

I. TIMES OF DIVINE SERVICE.

II. MODES OF DIVINE SERVICE.

III. THE CONSTITUTION AND ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT.

IV. THE CONSERVATION OF THE FAITH.

The limits assigned to this lecture compel a brief and, on

that account, somewhat unsatisfactory consideration and discussion, even of the prominent specific human ordinances under each of the foregoing classes.

I. TIMES OF DIVINE SERVICE.

The principles regulating human ordinances in the Church are to be applied to the times of divine service.

a. The Lord's Day: Ground of Obligation for its Observance. Of most frequent occurrence, and of chief importance among the holidays and festivals, is the weekly observance of the Lord's day. Here, however, at the threshold of our view of special ordinances in the Church, we meet a somewhat perplexing question, viz.: what is the ground of the obligation to observe the Lord's day? If that day is to be observed because of a divine command, that at least one day in Seven shall be devoted to holy use, as distinct from secular use, then this divine appointment involves essentially the ceremonial element of the Jewish Sabbath, and hence it does not pertain to human ordinances to designate the proportion of time which shall be devoted to holy use. Yet the Confessions of our Church seem clearly to teach that the designation of the first day of the week, as a time to be employed in holy use, is not to be referred to a divine obligation that the specified proportion of one day in seven is to be kept as a holy day, but that the observance of the Lord's day is to be referred to the necessity for such suitable time as the Church, in the exercises of her liberty, shall apportion, in order stately to administer the means of grace, and to worship God publicly in the sanctuary. The Augsburg Confession, Art. xxviii., says: "what then, should be held concerning Sunday and other similar Church ordinances and ceremonies? To this we reply: That the bishops or pastors may make such regulations, so that things may be carried on orderly in the Church. * * * Those, then, who are of opinion, that such institution of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was established as a thing necessary, err very much. For the Holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath, and it teaches that all ceremonies of the old law, since the revelation of the gospel, may be discontinued. And yet as it was necessary to appoint

a certain day, so that the people might know when they should assemble, the Christian Church ordained Sunday for that purpose, and possessed rather more inclination and willingness for this alteration, in order that the people might have an example of Christian liberty, that they might know that neither the observance of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is indispensable.* Luther, in his Larger Catechism, commenting on the Third Commandment, says: "it is necessary to observe that we keep the Sabbath-day, [Lord's day] * * * mostly for the purpose of enabling us to embrace time and opportunity on these Sabbath-days, since we cannot otherwise embrace them, to attend to divine service, so that we may assemble ourselves to hear and treat of the word of God, and to praise him, by singing and prayer. But this, I say, is not so confined to time, as it was among the Jews, that it must be precisely this or that day, for one day is not better in itself than another, but it should be daily attended to; but since the common class of people cannot attend to it, we should reserve one day in the week at least, for this purpose. Inasmuch, however, as Sunday has been set apart from old for this purpose, we should therefore let it remain so, that the Sabbath may be observed with uniformity, and that no one create disorder through unnecessary innovation."† Without entering upon an extended exegesis of the passages of Scripture which relate to this question, it may be observed that the foregoing language of the Confessions indicates that the moral obligation of the Third Commandment does not pertain to the designation of one seventh of time for holy use as distinct from secular use, but to the holy use of whatsoever time human ordinances, in conformity to the law of good order, may designate for the administration of the word and sacraments, and for the worship of God. In other words, under the gospel, there is no day nor time, in itself by divine command, more holy than another, but there is a moral obligation resting upon the Church to administer the means of grace and to worship God publicly in the sanctuary, cf. Mt. 28: 19,

*Book of Concord, Henkel's Eng. Edit., p. 137.

†Book of Concord, Henkel's Eng. Edit., p. 449.

20; Heb. 10: 25; and consequently to set apart such times for these purposes, as the law of good order may designate. This doctrine of the Confession seems to be sanctioned by the divine word. The seventh day which God blessed and sanctified at creation, Gen. 2: 2, 3, may be understood, consistently with the various durations of time, which Gesenius assigns to the word יוֹם, day,* as the last of those vast geological periods which science requires for the creation and existence of the pre-Adamite world. "They who contend," says Tayler Lewis, "that the divine Sabbath is simply the first twenty-four hours after creation, make it unmeaning as predicted of God and his works." Lange Com. Gen. p. 196. This interpretation of the Sabbath, instituted in Paradise, as the beginning of the rest of God from all creative work, and which rest is to end at "the regeneration" when the new heavens and the new earth shall appear. Rev. 21: 1, is in harmony with the New Testament idea, that under the gospel dispensation there is no divinely ordained distinction of days, but that every day is to be sanctified. Hence the reference in the Third Commandment to the seventh day of rest which began at the end of the six creative days, may be understood analogically; for as Gerhard says in his "Loci Theologici:" "Neither is there in Genesis any trace of the sanctification of the seventh day before the giving of the Law."† The observance of the Sabbath, Ex. 16: 24, previous to the announcement of the Third Commandment at Sinai, Ex. 10: 8, and which Dr. Paley considers its first institution, Moral Philos, Bk. V. ch. 7, may be understood proleptically, as is the Saviour's announcement to Nicodemus of the doctrine of bap-

* "Spoken of the natural day, from the rising to the setting sun, also of the civil day or 24 hours, which includes the night." Also, "time," Gesen. Heb. Lex. Sub. יוֹם. Such also is the varied signification of day in English. 1. "The space of time between the rising and setting of the sun. 2. The whole time or period of one revolution of the earth on its axis, or twenty-four hours. 3. Age; time with reference to the existence of a person or thing."—*Webster's Dict.*

†XIII. § 139. Note. * * nec ullum exstat vestigium sanctificationis diei septimi in Genesi ante promulgationem legis.

tismal regeneration, which was not formally announced to the Church, until the great commission was given, after the resurrection, Matt. 28 : 19, 20. The New Testament indicates the abrogation not only of a specific but of a generic Sabbath. "One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord," Rom. 14 : 5, 6. The meaning of the apostle seems evidently to be, that if a man regardeth a day at all as the Sabbath it should be because of the holy use of the day as distinct from secular use, and not because one day in itself is to be esteemed above another. "He struck not at a day but at a principle. If * * he only meant to establish a new set of days in the place of the old, there is no intelligent principle for which he is contending, and that earnest apostle is only a champion for one day instead of another, an assertor of the eternal sanctities of Sunday, instead of the eternal sanctities of Saturday" Rev. F. W. Robertson, Serm., vol. 2, p. 202. "The obvious influence from his (Paul's) arguing, is that he * * believed all times and days alike," Alford, Com. Rom. 14 : 6. "Let no man, therefore, judge you in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbaths; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ," Col. 2 : 16, 17. "The holiday is yearly; the new moon, monthly; the Sabbaths weekly. * * Paul intimates here the removal of all distinctions of days; Christ clearly taught the liberty of the Sabbath. * * The Lord's day is mentioned, not enjoined. A stated day is useful and necessary to those who are engrossed in worldly concerns. They who keep a continual Sabbath, enjoy greater liberty. The Sabbath is a type even of eternal things, Heb. 4 : 3, 4, yet its obligation does not therefore continue in the New Testament, otherwise the new moons should be retained," Bengel, Gnomon, Col. 2 : 16. The doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in regard to the ground of obligation for the observance of the Lord's Day is thus stated by Rev. H. E. Jacobs, D. D. "She utterly repudiates the Sabbath as a day, call it by what name you please. She regards every day as the Sabbath of the believer, and no day as the Sabbath of the unbeliever,

* * * whilst rejecting the Sabbath as a part of the ceremonial law she clings with affection to the day on which her Lord rose, as a day to rejoice and be glad in, as a day on which the great congregation can assemble, and join heart and voice, with the Church triumphant in ascriptions of honor and glory to Him that loved us and gave Himself for us. * * She will allow no one to judge her with respect to the Sabbath day ; but at the same time, she will allow no one to deprive her of the Lord's day," *Ev. Rev.*, vol. 20, p. 152.

b. The Ecclesiastical Year.—From the consideration of weekly festivals, we turn to that of yearly festivals. As the moral element in the observance of the Lord's day consists in the holy use of time as distinct from its secular use, and the ceremonial element appears in the designation of times and modes of observance according to the law of good order ; so we find a moral and a ceremonial element in the ground of obligation for the observance of yearly festivals. The moral element is the recognition of remarkable manifestations of divine providence and grace ; the ceremonial element is the designation of such events in conformity to the law of good order. Under the Old Testament, the divine ordinances required the yearly commemoration of important events in the constitution and development of the Jewish Church. These stated festivals afforded opportunity to instruct the people in the essential truths relative to the events ; they did much to confirm the faith of the Jews in their religion, and were of great advantage in promoting acquaintance and friendship among the several Jewish tribes. The most conspicuous of these Jewish festivals was typical of the atonement for sin by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God ; another was typical of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the planting of the Christian Church. The moral element in both these Jewish festivals is perpetuated under the gospel, by the special recognition of divine grace in the fulfillment of the type by the observance of Good-Friday and Whit-Sunday as holy days. The ceremonial element in the Jewish festivals is modified by the Christian Church, so as to designate only such festivals as the ethical and aesthetic principles of the law

of good order determine, viz.: that yearly festivals of the Christian Church, should not be excessive in number, and should not include any festal days to commemorate the saints, but should be restricted to a recognition of the chief events in the life of Christ, and of those doctrines which are essential to salvation. Wicklif, the forerunner of the reformation, is represented by Neander, in his Church History,* as contending that in his day many thought that all saint-day festivals should be abolished, and the festival of Christ alone remain; for thus Christ would be kept in more lively remembrance and the devotion of the faithful would not be so improperly distributed between Christ and His members. As reasons for the observance of yearly festivals or holidays by the Christian Church, it may be said, that if those events of the Jewish Church which typified the advent of Christ, were worthy of commemoration, much more worthy are those which have so wonderfully fulfilled the type. If there are any events worthy of a special commemoration, they are those which characterize the earthly life of our Saviour, and if there are truths worthy of special recognition, they are those which He uttered. The same reason which justifies the celebration of our National anniversary and Thanksgiving day, sanctions the usage of the Christian Church, in the exercise of her liberty with respect to the observance of days, to set apart certain days to commemorate exclusively the great events and fundamental truths of Christianity. "The pillars on which Christianity rests, are matters of fact, such as the birth, miracles, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension of the Saviour. Hence any rational method tending to extend and perpetuate the knowledge of these facts must exert a salutary influence on Christianity itself."† A systematic arrangement of the festivals and holidays of the Church into a calendar exhibits the ecclesiastical year; the design of which is thus set forth in a sermon by Dr. Ahlfeld, translated by Rev. L. W. Heydenreich, in Ev. Rev., vol. 5, p. 280: "The Church has become almost totally

*Eng. Ed., Vol. 5, p. 167.

†S. S. Schmucker, D. D., *Lutheran Manual*, p. 175.

unconscious of the significance of her ecclesiastical year. * * Some may perhaps even ask the question, what has the year to do with the Church, or what has the Church to do with the year? The sun rules the common year. One rotation of the earth around it constitutes the annual circle, which successively develops the lovely spring, the ardent summer, the rich autumn and the severe and silent winter. Each of these parts has its peculiar character. In the firmament of the Church, there also stands a sun whose name is Jesus Christ ; it shines by day and by night, forever and ever. And as the earth moves around the visible sun, so the Church moves around the sun of divine grace, so she travels through the sacred history of the Saviour. Her spring is the lovely season of Christmas and Epiphany, when Christ is born a man, when in his glory He declares himself to be the Son of God with power. Her summer is the season of Lent, and the Passion-time of Jesus Christ, in which the anticipation of His death rests upon her like heavy, sultry days, until at last the storm of death, so long approaching, breaks forth, and the flash of lightning descends out of the black sin-cloud and slays the righteous. Her harvest time and autumn are the days when the Holy Spirit is poured out upon the disciples, and when in the lovely, long Trinity Sundays, one kind of fruit after another of the gifts of the Triune God is borne into the granary of the heart. The greatest diversity of events in the life of the Lord are crowded into this rich period. And wherever He stands and whatever He does or asks presents a field from which the believer may reap and gather. At last comes the severe and silent winter. From the twentieth Sunday after Trinity begin the gospels, which treat of the final things. * * On the last Sunday, the twenty-seventh after Trinity, all the different gospels which are used, treat of the entrance into the kingdom of glory. Thus on the first day of the ecclesiastical year, the Lord is announced in whom we may have life abundantly ; on the last day believers have reached the goal of all their labors. The ecclesiastical year is a correct one ; it is better regulated than the common year. It begins with its spring-messengers and spring, and ends not only with winter, with death and judgment, but also with victory over

death and judgment. The common year begins with winter, and at its close it is again winter. There is no natural progress in it. The Christian's life should be nothing but a journey around this heavenly orb, in order that he may experience its warming and enlightening influences." These extracts show that the design of the ecclesiastical year is to exhibit, within the cycle of the siderial year, and in "good order," the truths pertaining to the persons and the work of the Triune God ; and, likewise, the duties and experience which pertain immediately to the Church. This idea is in harmony with the divine word, that "all Scripture is profitable for doctrine, and instruction in righteousness," and this idea is best realized through the systematic arrangement of the ecclesiastical year. The two services on the Lord's day and one in the midst of the week afford opportunity, not only for the commemoration of events and truths designated by the ecclesiastical year, but for the consideration and improvement of any providential events or necessities in the experience of the local congregations. With respect to the arrangement of the ecclesiastical year, the following ideas are submitted, and which are derived from an article by Prof. Plitt, of Bonn, on "The relation of the Sermon to the Church year," translated by Rev. J. D. Severinghaus in the Ev. Rev., vol. 18, p. 169. There are two chief divisions of equal length, including twenty-six weeks each. The first division relates chiefly to the person of Christ, beginning with the first Sunday in Advent, or the fourth Sunday before Christmas, ending with the Sunday which commemorates the Trinity of the Godhead. The second division relates especially to the Church, and extends from the first Sunday after Trinity Sunday to the first Sunday in Advent. The first division of the Church year, or the half year of the Lord, is "the season of commencing, of carrying through, and of finishing the great work," or, Christmas season, a Lent season, and a season of glorification. The birth of Christ belongs to the first ; his sufferings and death to the second ; his resurrection and ascension to the third. With regard to the second division, *i. e.* the half year of the Church, "we have also a time of beginning, which is the season of the apostles and their doctrine ; a time of carrying

through, which is the time of the martyrs and of sufferings; a time of finishing, which is the season of the angels and of the end, or of the last things." With respect to this outline of the ecclesiastical year and its observance, it may be said that the Evangelical Lutheran Church, consistently with the doctrinal position of the fifteenth article of the Augsburg Confession, holds a conservative position between that of the Roman Church with its excessive multiplication of festal and saints' days; and that of most Reformed Churches, which radically proscribes the observance of any special days to commemorate the great facts and truths of Christianity. It is to be said, however, that in other portions of the Reformed Churches, apart from the Protestant Episcopal Church, there are indications of a growing appreciation of a proper observance of the ecclesiastical year.

c. *"Protracted Meetings."*—There is a usage prevalent in some portions of the Church, which relates to the observance of special days or times for the administration of the word, in order to effect the immediate conversion of the impenitent, and to arouse professing Christians who have fallen into a state of spiritual indifference. Such special occasions are sometimes called "protracted meetings." One theory upon which these extra meetings are held, implies that the stated administration of the word on the Lord's day and once in the midst of the week, as is customary in most churches, is not an adequate arrangement; but that if the attention of men is held continuously and closely for a season to the subject of religion they are more apt to be moved to a holy life, than if there are constant intervals of several days between the preaching of the word. In reply to such an inference, it is to be said that, as "the Holy Spirit works faith, when and where it pleases God, in those who hear the gospel," Augs. Con., Art. V., that is, "with respect to the presence, the operations, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, no one ought to, or can always, judge *ex sensu*, that is, as to manner and time in which these things are perceived in the heart, but they frequently occur, and are concealed under our great imperfections," Form Concord, Dec. (II), therefore we cannot determine the inadequacy of the stated administration of the word, if we do not perceive immediately the fruit of the

Spirit's power in the word. To use an illustration of Chemnitz: "Just as the motion of the air is now violent, now gentle, now not perceived at all, so the regenerated must know that the presence and operating power of the Spirit is not measured by the perception of spiritual movements."* It seems to be a just inference, however, that the attempt to determine a time and place for the manifestation of divine grace through a special public administration of the word, tends to the disparagement of the efficiency of its stated public administration. Extra meetings for the public administration of the means of grace may be advocated consistently with objection to the revival system, when they are not based upon the same ground of necessity or usefulness as that upon which the revival system rests. Such extra meetings are held by the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in the observance of the ecclesiastical year; in the custom of catechization; in holding services preparatory to the observance of the Lord's Supper; and in personal interviews with those who have been awakened through the stated public administration of the means of grace. If there is necessity for special public administration of the word to adults on the ground that its stated public administration is inadequate, the required opportunity is presented in catechization; for catechization, whilst it is principally designed to be an official administration of the word to the children of the Church, who receive regenerating grace in Baptism, in order to prepare them for communicant membership by their voluntary confirmation of baptismal vows, yet it likewise affords an opportunity to administer the word to adults, not baptized, and for such as were baptized in infancy, but who, from neglect to nurture the spiritual life through childhood, have fallen from grace. "Tested by its fruits, the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal grace, when faithfully preached and consistently developed, will bear favorable comparison with the modern system of periodical efforts, or with any other system of doctrine and usage ever employed for the promotion of experimental religion and the development of true piety," F. W. Conrad, D. D., Lect. on Augs. Conf. 1874.

*Quoted in Besser's, "Christ the Light of the World," Huxtable's trs. p. 136.

p. 76. The objection to the revival system, therefore, does not arise on account of extra meetings in themselves considered, but because they involve the inference that a faithful use of the stated times and opportunities for administering the means of grace are not adequate to a proper development of the Church, and because it is assumed that through these extra meetings the development of the Church is best realized. Another theory upon which so-called protracted meetings are maintained is the alleged attractive power in the extra meetings which is available for bringing large numbers under the influence of the truth, and which does not pertain to the stated service of the sanctuary. Upon this theory we cannot, however, refer the attraction simply to the means of grace; for they are, in themselves considered, as efficacious at one time as another; hence any superior popularity of the extra meetings of the revival system, must be referred to influences which are incidental to or associated with the administration of the word; such as the excitement awakened, or expected, from the mere assembling of large numbers of people on special occasions; the curiosity of some to witness the manifestations of alleged spiritual awakening in individuals; or sensationalism in singing or in preaching the word. The objection to the revival system as a human agency which designates a periodical season for the immediate manifestation of divine grace, does not involve a denial of the fact, that there have been genuine revivals of religion in the Church, wrought by the Holy Spirit through the truth; but when we attempt to specify the human agency which developed them, or to indicate the way of the Spirit in producing them, it must often be said, as our Saviour has said of the kingdom of God, that it "cometh not with observation," Lk. 17:20. If extra meetings are necessary for immediate manifestations of divine grace, on the ground that the stated services of the Church are inadequate to its development, we might consistently apply the same principle to the curriculum of education in Theological Seminaries. Experience in such institutions, however, proves that a systematic course of study of divine truth stately and faithfully administered, does not require a periodical continuity of intense application for several weeks, in order

to a healthful intellectual development of the students, but that this end is best attained when there is a regular and equitable distribution of recitations throughout the academic year. If the stated public administration of the word to adults, twice on the Lord's day, and once in the midst of the week, and the administration of baptism as a means of regeneration for infants, with their subsequent catechetical instruction as a preparation for communicant membership, together with the administration of the Lord's Supper to adults as a means of sanctification, have been designated by almost uniform and constant observance, in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and have proven through experience, when faithfully observed, to be adequate for the development of the Church in harmony with the will of God, it would seem that the Church should apply her force and fidelity to these stated and established opportunities, rather than ignore their sufficiency by a reliance upon the periodical revival.

II. MODES OF SERVICE IN THE SANCTUARY.

It is the function of the human agency in the development of the Church not only to designate the times of ecclesiastical service, but likewise to regulate the mode of its administration. This aspect of human ordinances in the Church has much significance. The character of the Church is illustrated and its spirit is revealed by the manner of its service in the sanctuary. Divine service in the sanctuary consists of two essentially distinct parts, (i). The worship of God, (ii). The administration of the means of grace.

a. Principles of the Cultus.—With respect to public worship, Olshausen* observes: "The element of adoration, with spurious objectiveness, has acquired in the Roman Church an undue predominance, while in the Reformed Church, with spurious subjectiveness, the preacher and his discourse have too much supplanted the element of adoration. The middle course is the right one, and it requires the two to be so distributed that the minister may stand forth not only in his subjectiveness as a

*Com. Acts 2: 42-47, vol. 4, p. 393, trans. by Lindsay.

teacher, but also as the organ through which the adoration of the Church receives expression." Dr. Höfling, in an article on "The Principles of the Cultus of the Evangelical Church,"* presented five principles as constituting liturgical action, which may be characterized by the terms, truth, freedom, generality, decorum and solemnity. With respect to truth he says: "The only objectively true and Evangelical faith of the Bible in redemption is just as truly expressed as it is appealed to by the cultus." Of freedom he says: "there is no ceremonial law of the New Testament; the acts of the cultus do not possess a character of external works commanded of God, * * the consciences of believers are not bound by this or that form of external worship, and the order of worship becomes an intolerable commandment of men, as soon as it is claimed to be a necessary element of the divine order of salvation." Of generality he says: "The Christian cultus is no merely individual, subjective or private worship, but public, common, and churchly. Its subject is not the individual believer *per se*, but the congregation of believers. Hence we infer that the merely individual and subjective understanding of the Scriptures, cannot be enforced, *nolens volens*, as objective truth, but wholly the common interpretation of the Church; and that the private faith of the individual subject cannot lay claim to be exhibited in the cultus, but the faith of the congregation." In reference to the relation of the worship of a local congregation to that of the total, after quoting the seventh article of the Augsburg Confession, that "it is not necessary to the true unity of the Christian Church that uniform traditions, rites and ceremonies of human appointment, should be everywhere observed," and that "it is sufficient that the gospel be rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered," Dr. Höfling adds: that "the requisition that the worship of God should bear a churchly common character, that all the local congregations should agree, refers, especially * * to those acts in which, not so much the local as the total congregation is seen to act by the organ of her called servants in

*Translated by Rev. H. S. Lasar, *Ev. Rev.* vol. 10, p. 232, sq.

the name of God." It is not designed, however, by this principle, to neglect or ignore in any respect the spiritual wants and experience of the individual and of local congregations in public worship, but simply that the faith and worship of the Church in general, should be preëminently exhibited, as we shall observe more particularly hereafter. In reference to the fourth principle, decorum, he says: "A form of public and common action, like that of the cultus, cannot and dare not refuse to submit to the rule of the general moral law of order and decency; will not sacrifice the proper organization and orderly course of such action to accident or the option of a few individuals. * * The several parts must be united to an organic whole, and the different acts follow in such a succession as characterize the nature and end of common worship. * * The chief requisitions of this principle are the exactness in time and place, as well as the order and course of worship, the proper distribution of the different functions, and especially the provision made of particular organs to direct cultus-action." In reference to the fifth principle, solemnity, he says: "Cultus action cannot dispense with beauty and art, its end being to afford an expression to be perceived by the senses of something spiritual, and to keep everything distant that is low and common, all that is sensuous, impure and unworthy, or merely sensuous and not a reflex of the spiritual. But as little as the contents of the cultus is the spiritual and ideal generally, just so little can liturgic action be identical with artistic action generally, or beauty be its highest law. There is an immense, a specific difference between profane and sacred art. Profane art never advances higher than a religious contemplation of the world, but true churchly art is the representation of the divine, apprehended in the natural contemplation of God for the end of common devotion. The spiritual, as the contents of the cultus and calculated for the senses, * * is that which is holy *per se*. It being brought to exhibit itself directly in a proper manner, its result is not the beautiful, but the solemn. All liturgical action will correspond with this principle, if in it the arts are disrobed of all their own natural ideal contents, renouncing all efforts by their dexterity and skill to please; if they serve but the sacred

object they are to represent, both respecting form and contents, and appear as entirely devoted to and exclusively determined by it, in their production." The author then adds respecting these principles: "the less isolated they coöperate and the greater their harmonious union and mutual interpretation, the more living, the more pleasing in every direction and the more perfectly satisfactory will the *cultus* appear. No one element of religion and piety will make itself felt at the expense and exclusion of the others. * * On the mutual mediation of these, * * on their resolution into a higher unity and not upon their displacing and excluding each other, depends chiefly, the living character of the *cultus*."

b. General Synod's Order of Public Worship. Accepting these principles and guided by them, our General Synod formulates and presents in the Book of Worship, an order of public service in the sanctuary, in the observance of which the objective truth of the divine word, which is essential in true worship, is manifested every Lord's day in the morning service; thus conforming to the first principle of liturgical action. The non-observance of this ritual at other stated public services may serve to illustrate the second of the foregoing principles, viz. freedom; for thus it appears that "the consciences of believers are not bound by this or that form of external worship," nor does the order of worship become "an intolerable command of men," as though an unalterable liturgical service was "a necessary element of the divine order of salvation." The order of public worship on the Lord's day at the morning service also recognizes the third principle, termed generality, by which the local congregation exhibits the faith and worship of the Church in general. There is, with an exception or two, to which we shall presently advert, a proper arrangement and proportion of the several parts, so as to constitute an organic whole well calculated to edify the soul and to elevate it to a truly devotional experience. Each of the five liturgical principles already referred to has its special significance and value. The third principle, named generality, especially furnishes an argument of much force for the use of a liturgical form of worship. That principle requires that the local congregation shall ade-

quately express the faith and worship of the general or total Church. A prescribed formula by which the total Church is assured that her own faith and worship, and not the subjective views or feelings of the individual minister or local congregation are expressed, is therefore a necessity. An examination of the order of service, in the Book of Worship, will show that the first acts of service by the local congregation are an exhibition and confession of the faith and devotion of the Church in general. The Introits, the Gloria Patri, the Confession of Sin, concluding with the Kyrie Eleison, the Confession of Faith in the Apostles' Creed, and the Gloria in Excelsis, embody not simply the worship and faith of the individual Christian or congregation; but especially is the Church Catholic represented in all the essential aspects of her faith and worship. There is perhaps ground for a minor criticism, that there is incompleteness in our order of service by the omission of rubrics to direct the congregation in the use of the liturgy; also by the omission of the declaration of absolution, which seems appropriate after the confession of sin and the Kyrie. For as the Church in general practically and appropriately illustrates her faith in the confession of sin, there would be conformity to good order and truth by practically and appropriately illustrating her faith in the forgiveness of sin, which indeed she professes in the Apostles' Creed, but which is not announced to the believing penitent. The twenty-fifth article of the Augsburg Confession says: "Our preachers diligently teach that confession should be retained for the sake of absolution, which is the principal and most valuable thing in it, to bring consolation to alarmed consciences, as well as for several other reasons." It is also doubtful whether it was an improvement to substitute the indefinite expression in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into the place of departed spirits," for the phrase, "He descended into Hell." Certainly it is the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as stated by Luther, according to the Formula of Concord, (IX.) "that the whole person, God and man, after his burial, descended into hell, and destroyed its power." Thus it is also stated in Luther's Smaller Catechism, in the Apostles' Creed, that Christ "descended into hell." The reading of the Pericopes designated in the ec-

clesiastical calendar, also harmonizes with proper liturgical action, if there is an observance of the Church year. The importance of the principle that the local church should represent the objective faith and worship of the total Church, is not, however, by any means designed to ignore the subjective wants or necessities of the individual or of the local congregation; indeed as integral constituents of the entire Church, they must individually experience the common faith and devotion which they represent. But beyond the individual experience in the common worship, the service of the sanctuary provides for the spiritual wants of the individual and of the local congregation, by the opportunity for extemporeaneous prayer and for hymns adapted to special wants or occasions. The sermon, likewise, which is the prominent part of divine service, is usually delivered stately three times during the week, and thereby opportunity is given not only for the consideration of topics suggested by the Church year, but likewise by individual or congregational experience. This recognition of that which is public, common and churchly, and likewise of that which is individual, subjective and local pertains to the cultus of the General Synod; which has "preserved the continuity of the past life of the Church with the present, in the adoption of forms, sacred through long association, and in making provision at the same time for the peculiar needs of the hour in unwritten prayers."^{*}

c. Art in Worship. It was observed in the fifth liturgical principle, that "cultus action cannot dispense with beauty and art, its end being to afford an expression to be perceived by the senses of something spiritual," but as liturgical action is not identical with artistic action, "the arts must serve the sacred objects they represent, and appear as entirely devoted to it." Guided by this principle, the aesthetic judgment constructs and adorns the sanctuary, so that the external associations of divine service may awaken and cherish a truly devotional spirit; it avoids, on the one hand, a gaudy meretricious taste which ministers to pride and vanity; and on the other, that bald simplicity which does not apprehend the nature nor power of sacred art.

*L. E. Albert, D. D., *Lutheran Diet*, 1877, p. 272.

The true ethical and æsthetic judgment discards all melodies in divine service, which simply please the sensuous taste, or draw attention to the artistic skill of the performer, yet fail to awaken true devotion in the soul, and which, however appropriate elsewhere, are incongruous with the solemn associations of the house of God. It forbids all sensationalism, and whilst it requires eloquence and art in the ministry of the word, they must be concealed in the pre-eminent appearance and power of the truth. It makes a distinction to the eye, between the worship of God and the administration of His word, when the minister conducts the liturgical service in the chancel and delivers the sermon from the pulpit; and it is in conformity with a right liturgical form of public service in the sanctuary that the officiating minister should wear a distinctive robe in the performance of his official work. A plain vestment of black unlike the gaudy robes of the Roman priest, serves to identify the character of the minister and his office, and to impress upon the people the solemnity of the divine service in which they engage. Rev. John Hall, D. D., an eminent Presbyterian clergyman of New York city, says: "It does not follow, because a preacher is not a priest, that he is nothing but a paid speaker, or leader, or lecturer. He is an ambassador of Christ, a minister of the gospel, a commissioned officer in the Lord's sacramental host, called of God before he was called by the people of his particular charge; and whatever in dress or address will keep this in his own mind and in the mind of his people and the community, is not quite despicable. In the recoil from dead officialism in some parts of the country, it has been accepted as the proper thing for a clergyman to avoid, in some degree, any distinctive professional characteristics. This, however, may, like all reactions, be carried to the point where some evil begins; and it is just where this policy has ruled, and where sacred things are habitually divested of all sacred concomitants, that we should look for another and opposite reaction in favor of a florid or stately service."* Jacobson, in Herzog's *Real Encyclopaedia*, vol. 7, p. 734, under Art. *Kleider und Insignien*,

**Princeton Review*, Mar. 1878, p. 354.

says that "ministers in the first centuries in the ordinary intercourse of life did not distinguish themselves from the people by their clothing, but beyond doubt they did so in the performance of their official acts."^{*} And we may observe in the portraits of many eminent ministers of various Protestant churches, since the days of the reformation, that they are represented with a distinctive clerical apparel.

III CONSTITUTION AND ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT.

Thus far the application of the principles regulating human ordinances has been made to *times* and *modes* of divine service. Another distinct function of the human agency which claims attention is the constitution and administration of government in the church.

a. Relation between Church and State. A preliminary reference to the relation between Church and State will not require an extended discussion; inasmuch as it is a fundamental law of this nation, with which the public sentiment accords, that the state cannot officially coöperate with the church in its government or development. The first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The Church and State, are alike divinely ordained institutions for the welfare of humanity and each has its distinct sphere and object, yet they are by no means absolutely independent of each other. Whilst it is exclusively the function of the State, to protect life and property; and of the Church to administer the means of divine grace for the salvation of men, yet there is reciprocal protection. The State is the guardian of the Church, so that in its free development, "no one dares to molest it or make it afraid," a blessing which we need not go far back in history to learn to appreciate. We have but to recall the "Thirty Years' War," which desolated Germany, and the trials of England under Queen Mary and King James, II. The principle that the Church shall not be persecuted for its

*Im gemein verkehr unterschieden sich aber in den ersten Jahrhunderten die Beamten, dann der Klerus von dem Volke in der Kleidung nicht, wogegen dies ohne Zweifel bei Amtsverrichtungen geschah.

faith, was completely settled, and we trust forever, by the victory of the Protestants at Lutzen in 1632, associated with the heroic martyrdom of Gustavus Adolphus, and by the English revolution of 1688. On the other hand, the Church is the true guardian of the State. The spirit of Christianity as well as its precepts educate the citizen to loyalty, industry, and humanity. These are the best standing army of a nation; and it needs no prophet's eye to discern that the hope of perpetuating our noble civil government, must rest upon the intelligence and piety of the people. "The nation that forgets God shall perish." This obligation of the Church to infuse its faith into the state by no means implies that there should be any organic union between them, nor that the faith of the Church should be formally engrailed upon the constitutional law of the state. Our country affords an illustrious example to the nations of Europe which yet perpetuate an organic union of Church and State, that the Church can be faithful to her calling in her own sphere, distinct from organic union with civil government, and thereby aid the state and receive its protection in return. And whilst she has wisely refrained from attempting to exhibit her confession of faith in the national constitution, she has, to some extent, developed in its subjects the righteousness which "exalteth a nation."

b. Specific forms of Church Government: Papal; Episcopal; Presbyterian; Congregational; Evangelical Lutheran. Of more immediate practical interest and importance to us than the relation between Church and State, is the constitution and administration of Government in the Church; inasmuch as the subjective views of men, herein, again, widely differ in the application of the principles regulating human ordinances in the Church. Such importance pertains to modes of constituting government in the Church, that they serve in a great measure to mark and identify several of the great denominations of Christendom. Four different forms of government exist in the Christian Church in this land, viz.: the Papal, the Episcopal, the Presbyterian and the Congregational, representing respectively, monarchical, aristocratic, representative and democratic ideas of government. The Papal form of government is indeed admin-

istered by a body of clergy of different ranks and orders, but of this hierarchy, the Pope or Bishop of Rome is regarded as the supreme head of the visible Church, who in his official capacity is infallible in his judgment and absolute in his authority. The Episcopal form of government in the Protestant Church involves the principle that a succession from the Apostles in the order of bishops, as an order distinct from and superior to those who are called presbyters or teaching elders in the Church, is a requisite without which a valid Christian ministry cannot be preserved. The Methodist Episcopal Church discards the principle of an apostolic succession as necessary to a valid ministry, but "regards Episcopacy as essential to the itinerary."* A third form of government in the Church, called the Presbyterian, maintains "that as to the bishops and presbyters, the Holy Scriptures make no difference between them," but that "all ministers of the gospel, although described by different names and titles, which designate their various functions, are of equal rank." This form of government holds that it is "agreeable to Scriptures that the Church be governed by congregational, presbyterial and synodical assemblies."† The Presbyterian organization is thus set forth in the "Westminster Confession of Faith," 1647,‡ Chap. 31:

Sec. 1. "For the better government and further edification of the Church, there ought to be such assemblies as are currently called *synods* or *councils*." The American Edition here adds: "And it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches by virtue of their office, and the power which Christ hath given them for edification and not for destruction, to appoint such assemblies, and to convene together in them, as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the Church, Acts 15: 22, 23, 25.

Sec. 2. "It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially, to determine controversies of faith and cases of conscience, to set

*J. F. Crane, D. D., *Methodism and its Methods*, p. 185.

†J. M. Krebs, D. D., Art. *Presbyterian Church*, in Rupp's *Hist. of Relig. Denom.* in U. S., p. 567.

‡Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 3, p. 669.

down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God and government of His Church; to receive complaints in cases of maladministration, and authoritatively to determine the same; which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in His word."

A fourth form of government is the Congregational. Those who adopt it "agree in the belief that the right of government resides in local churches or congregations of believers, who are responsible directly to the Lord Jesus Christ, the one Head of the Church universal, and of all particular churches."* Let us briefly estimate the value of each of these forms of government as human ordinances, from the stand point of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. With respect to the primacy of Peter, it is taught and declared in the "Dogmatic decrees of the Vatican Council, 1870," ch. 1, "that according to the testimony of the gospel the primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was immediately and divinely promised and given to blessed Peter the apostle, by Christ, the Lord."† With respect to the primacy of the Popes, his alleged successors, the following canon, occurs in ch. 2: "If then any should deny that it is by the institution of Christ, the Lord, or by divine right, that blessed Peter should have a perpetual line of successors in the primacy over the universal Church, or that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy; let him be anathema." With respect to the power of the Roman Pontiff, it is taught and declared in ch. 3, "that by the appointment of our Lord, the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other churches and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate, to which all, of whatever rank and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively are bound by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience to

*Declaration of the National Congregational Council at Oberlin, O., 1871, in Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 3, p. 737.

†Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. 2, p. 167, sq.

submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor, through the preservation of unity, both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation." The Roman Church claims this supreme authority for the Roman Pontiff, the alleged successor of Peter, as a divine right, on the ground that the following passage of Scripture, among others, confers it, Matt. 16: 18, 19. Christ said to Peter: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee, the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." The Protestant churches regard it essential to the right interpretation of this passage of Scripture, that the words of Christ to Peter be referred not to the person of Peter, but to the answer which Peter gave to the question which Christ asked all the disciples, "whom say ye that I am?" After the inadequate answers of some, Peter correctly replies, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." That confession of Peter is the rock upon which Christ has built his Church. In Matt. 18: 18, Christ says to all the disciples, what he had said to Peter: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," &c. The power of the keys, which it is alleged Christ gave to none but Peter, can only mean the office through which the promise of the Gospel is imparted to every one that desires it; yet this power, Christ expressly said, pertained to the whole Church; for after unavailing efforts to reconcile an offending brother, Christ directs that the difficulty shall be referred to the Church, and if the offender neglects to hear the Church "let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." The office of the keys was again bestowed not upon Peter but upon the disciples on the resurrection day: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain they are retained," Jno. 20: 23. Paul

places himself on an equality with Peter with respect to his office: "For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles," Gal. 2:8, and he ascribes to divine grace the ability to accomplish a greater work than any of the apostles; indeed he declares that he withstood Peter to his face, because he was to be blamed for dissembling with the Jews. But if Peter had any primacy of office we may reasonably suppose that Paul would have here recognized it. On the night of his betrayal, Christ taught the apostles, disputing among themselves who of them ought to be regarded as the vicar of Christ after his death, that he wanted no primacy among them. "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, but so shall it not be among you." Yet again we read that "the council of Nice, (325) resolved that the bishop or pastor of Alexandria, should provide for the Churches in the East, and the bishop or pastor of Rome for those in the West,"* showing the supremacy of the Church over the bishops, and denying the primacy of the bishop of Rome over all others. For these among other reasons the Protestant Church rejects the dogma that a proper constitution of the government of the Church must recognize the Pope by divine right as the supreme head and ruler of the Church. This article of the Roman Church, says Luther, "we hold and know to be false, impious, tyrannical and pernicious in the extreme to the Christian Church."† Respecting the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff, it is said in ch. 4 of the "Dogmatic decrees of the Vatican Council, 1870."‡ "We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks, *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine, regarding

*Appendix to Smalcald Articles, VI.

†Book Concord, Eng. Ed., p. 392.

‡Schaff's Creeds of Christendom, vol. 2, p. 271.

faith or morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." An illustration of papal "infallibility" occurs in the decree of Pope Paul V. (1616), confirmed by his successor Urban VIII. that Galileo's propositions (I) that the earth moves around the sun, and (II) "that the earth has a diurnal motion of rotation" are, "heretical," *i. e.* contrary to the teaching of Scripture, and "erroneous as to faith."* Of this dogma of Papal infallibility, a learned Pontiff, of irreproachable morals, viz.: Adrian VI. says, in a book reprinted at Rome in 1522, during his pontificate, that "it is certain, that the Pope may err in matters of faith in defending heresy by his opinions or decretals." D'Aubigne, giving the original of these words and the reference, says: "If the Ultramontanists reply that Adrian was mistaken on this point, by this very circumstance they affirm, what they deny, namely, the fallibility of the Popes."†

With respect to the Episcopal form of government, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, it is to be said that "some have recognized in Episcopacy an institution of divine origin, which is absolute and indispensable; others have represented it as destitute of all apostolic sanction and authority."‡ According to the former view, no Christian community can have a right to claim to be considered in the true sense a branch of the Church catholic or universal, if it have not episcopal organization. The latter view considers Episcopacy desirable to the good government of the Church, and to the maintainance of Evangelical truth and apostolical order, but not essential to its existence. It is evident, indeed it is conceded by advocates of the divine right of Episcopacy, that the offices of bishop and of presbyter in the New Testament are identical.§ Thus the presbyters or elders of the Ephesian Church summoned by St. Paul to meet

*Miss Clark's Life of Galileo, Ency. Brit. 9th Edit.

†Hist. Ref. vol. 3, p. 152, Am. Tract Soc. Ed.

Certum est quod Pontifex potint errare in iis quae tangunt fidem, haere. sim per suam determinationem aut decretatem asserendo, Conom. in lib. 4, Sententiarum Quest. de Saer. Confirm. Romæ, 1522, fol.

‡Dr. Lightfoot, quoted in Art. Episcopacy, in Ency. Brit. 9th Edit.

§Cf. Canon Venables, quoted in Art. Episcopacy, in Eng. Brit. 9th Edit.

him at Miletus, Acts. 20:17, (*μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους*,) are, in v. 28, designated by him bishops or "overseers" of the flock (*ἐν φύμας τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον ἔθετο επισκόπους*.) Paul directs Titus to ordain elders, Tit. 1:5, (*καταστήσῃς πρεσβυτέρους*,) and in the 2nd verse following, in describing their qualifications, he calls them bishops, v. 7, (*δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκιλητον εἶναι*). The same thing occurs in his epistle to Timothy, 1 Tim. 3:1, when he describes the qualification of a bishop for ruling well, (*εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπὸς ὀρέγεται*), and then in chap. 5, v. 17, calls those who rule well "elders," (*οἱ κολῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι*.) "Any conclusion, therefore, drawn from the use of the term 'bishop' in the New Testament, as to the existence of the episcopal office, as an office of superior rank or authority, to the office of presbyter or elder, would be fallacious."* The office of the apostles was indeed of superior rank and power to that of elders or bishops, but as the apostles were especially called, inspired and endowed with miraculous gifts, so we may believe, particularly in the absence of any positive scriptural or ecclesiastical testimony to the contrary, that their office in the Church likewise terminated with them, and was not perpetuated by the Episcopacy. Melanchthon in the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles, (Bk. Con. p. 403, Eng. ed.) says: "The gospel commands those who should regulate the Church, to preach the gospel, to remit sins, and to administer the sacraments; and it moreover gives them the authority to excommunicate those who live in the open commission of sin, and to absolve those who desire to amend their lives. Now every one, even our adversaries, must confess that all who preside over the Church have this command alike, whether they be called pastors or presbyters or bishops." The Formula of Government of the General Synod, (Ch. III. Sec. 1.) states that "the persons filling the clerical office in the New Testament, are designated in Scripture by different names as bishop, presbyter or elder, etc. All these are by divine right of equal rank." Hence we conclude that if an episcopal organization existed in the early Church, it is to be regarded entirely as a

*Canon Venables, Art. Episcopacy, Ency. Brit. 9th Edit.

human ordinance. Neander, in his Church History, thus explains the origin of the Episcopal office, as distinct from that of elder, in the early Christian Church: "Soon after the apostolic age, the standing office of president of the presbytery must have been formed; which president, as having preëminently the oversight over all, was designated by the special name of *Ἐπίσημος*, and thus distinguished from the other presbyters. Thus the name came at length to be applied exclusively to this presbyter, while the name presbyter continued at first to be common to all; for the bishops, as presiding presbyters, had no official character other than that of the presbyters generally. They were only *primi inter pares*."^{*} Considered merely as a human ordinance, the Episcopal form of government has been advocated, as promoting tranquillity and good order, and as not contradictory at least to the example of the Apostolic Church. It is thus considered "the means of the confederation of the Church. The bishop represents the Church, and is the centre of unity to the body, a safeguard against disunion and a security for the harmonious coöperation of its various constituents."[†] No doubt there is advantage to the local congregation and the rector or pastor, in the personal or individual oversight and visitation of a bishop; and in the Scandinavian countries, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and in Iceland, where the Evangelical Lutheran Church prevails, the Episcopal form of government is adopted, not as of divine obligation, but as a human ordinance of value to the Church. The Presbyterian and Congregational forms of government have been already described in the words of their own confessions of faith.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in this country, discarding Episcopacy, exhibits both Congregational and Presbyterian principles of government. It harmonizes with the doctrines of our Church, and the genius of our people, that the authority and government of the Church, in some respects should be vested entirely in the members of the local congregation and not delegated nor subjected to a foreign jurisdiction. Neander, commenting on the constitution of government in the early

*Vol. I, p. 190, Eng. Ed.

†Canon Venables, Ency. Brit. 9th Ed. Art. Episcopacy.

Christian Church, observes that "the monarchical form of government was not suited to the Christian community of spirit."* Thus our Church recognizes the Congregational polity to this extent that the local congregation is free to manage its own affairs in the control of its property, in the choice of its pastor, and in the ordinary government and discipline of its members. Yet the Presbyterian principle of organization appears in the synodical relation of the local congregations. In this relation the congregation adopts the constitution of Synod, and whilst it thus participates through its representative in the legislation of the general for the local Church, it is likewise subject to the authority of Synod, *e. g.* should the local congregation sever its connection with Synod by its own act, it may deprive itself of a pastor, who will teach its confession of faith, inasmuch as "pastors are amenable to Synod, which has the entire jurisdiction over them."† The advantage of an oversight of the Churches, which is attributed to the Episcopacy, is to some degree realized in the Evangelical Lutheran Church through the Synod and Synodical Conference. For these bodies visit the local congregations from time to time, not, however, as frequently as bishops or presiding elders; on the other hand the congregations through the lay delegates and pastors come into frequent association with the Church at large through the Synod and Conference, when the duties and responsibilities of the local congregations are in some measure supervised. It might be profitable to discuss the question whether in our Synodical Conference districts a systematic visitation of local congregations, by a suitable person in an official capacity, is feasible and desirable, and whether such a practice would be consistent with the Congregational and Presbyterian principles of government already recognized in our Church. Our General Synod is the representative, and likewise the legislative body for the entire Church. It possesses, however, advisory rather than judicial power. It is of great value in forming a bond of union in the Church, and in giving to it organic stability. It is also an important agency in the

*Ch. Hist. vol. 1, p. 183, Eng. Ed.

†Form. Gov. Ch. III, Sec. 3, Gen. Synod.

general missionary, benevolent and educational operations of the Church. From this cursory view of the several existing forms of government, it will be observed that the Evangelical Lutheran Church recognizes as principles, sanctioned by the New Testament; the parity of the ministry; the rights and liberty of the local congregation; the necessity, however, for representative government with authority to reach and render efficient the entire membership of the Church. These principles correspond with those which regulate our civil government, and embody the truth that human governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, whilst their efficiency and success, both in the Church and State, seem to require more than any other, the highest type of intelligence and piety in the people.

IV. CONSERVATION OF THE FAITH OF THE CHURCH.

There remains to be considered, the application of the principles regulating human ordinances in the Church, with respect to the conservation of the faith.

a. Creeds; their necessity and limitation. Formulas of Faith, called Creeds or Confessions of Faith, have been and ever will be a necessity in the constitution and development of the Church. The Creed is the testimony of the Church to divine truth; thus the Church declares what it believes; thus it reprobates the errors and unbelief of the world; thus it protects itself from the peril of false doctrines taught within its fold; thus it instructs its members in the knowledge of the divine word. Our inquiry now pertains, not to the necessity of Creeds as a defence of faith, against those without the Church who assail the truth, such as avowed atheists and infidels, but, to what extent human ordinances may defend the faith against those within the Church, of whom it is alleged that they are false teachers who misunderstand or pervert the truth of the divine word? The subjective views of the regenerate concerning the meaning of the divine word, are not exempt from the influence of the law of sin which is in their members, and which has impaired their mental as well as moral nature. Notwithstanding this incom-

plete sanctification of all believers, which has occasioned the various and discordant Creeds of Christendom, Christ declares that the Holy Spirit will guide the Church into all truth, Jno. 16 : 13, and that it can "know of the doctrine whether it be of God," Jno. 7 : 17. He has promised furthermore to be with His Church all the days of time, and that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. Hence that which especially marks and identifies the Church throughout her history, is, that she endeavors to "hold fast the form of sound words," 2 Tim. 1 : 13. She can suffer no man to take her crown, Rev. 3 : 11. This principle, which justifies the Church in establishing symbols, as the evidence and defence of her faith, and for the rejection of error, is recognized throughout Christendom. Hence the first controverted question in the Church respecting symbols of faith is not whether they are necessary, but what is their proper limitation. The entire Christian Church admits the necessity of contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, so far as the three ecumenical Creeds are concerned, viz.: the Apostles', the Nicene, and Athanasian, because those symbols express the subjective faith alike of the Protestant and Roman Churches. If we consider the doctrine which especially distinguishes the Protestant from the Roman Church, viz., Justification by faith alone, we find that doctrine engrafted on the various creeds of Protestantism as "the article of a standing or a falling Church;" over against the doctrine of the Roman Church, that there is a justifying merit in good works as well as in faith. When we consider the Protestant Church exclusively, we observe, however, a wide diversity of opinion respecting the doctrines of the divine word. United in the faith which exhibits the doctrines essential to salvation, and testifies to the errors of Romanism, the Protestant Church is itself divided upon doctrines which although not essential to salvation are fundamental with respect to a right understanding of the divine word. Hence the question occurs; shall the Church contend earnestly for the faith as it is expressed in the three ecumenical creeds, or does fidelity to the truth relate likewise to those doctrines concerning which there is diversity of opinion in the Protestant Church? Shall those doctrines alone, which are essential to salvation be em-

bodied in a confession of faith, or those likewise, which are essential to a right and full understanding of the word? It must be admitted, that there is a relative value, so far as the salvation of the soul is concerned, between doctrines confessed in the early creeds of the Universal Christian Church, and those doctrines which have divided Protestantism into denominations. Nevertheless the divine word indicates that the doctrines which divide the Protestant Church are fundamental with respect to the purity and completeness of the faith and to the welfare of the soul. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, &c., * * that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. The command of Christ is, "teaching all things whatsoever I have commanded you," Matt. 28:20. "Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 5:19. All the doctrines of Scripture are so related and essential that "the whole body" is "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part," Eph. 4:16. Hence error with respect to one doctrine affects to some degree the clearest apprehension of another, even as "the shattering of a single nerve in one extremity of the body is felt throughout the system."* "Truth is an undivided whole, the component parts of which are essentially connected, no one article of faith can be undervalued without affecting the integrity of the whole, (as far as an individual is personally concerned)."† To use another figure of the Apostle, whilst there is but one foundation upon which the Church can build, "for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. 3:11, yet it matters much whether upon that foundation the Church rears the superstructure of gold and silver and precious stones, or whether it builds of wood and hay and stubble. Whilst those in the Roman or in any Protestant Church, who truly believe in Christ as their Saviour, shall be saved; yet they shall

*C. F. Schaeffer, D. D.

†G. V. Lechler, D. D., *Com. Acts*, p. 81, Dr. C. F. Schaeffer's tr.

suffer loss, when they build upon the foundation of Christ, any doctrine or life not in harmony with the entire truth of the divine word, for "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire," 1 Cor. 3:13-15. Hence those who propagate error, even through ignorance of the truth, work incalculable mischief. Instead of a stately palace they rear an unsightly structure upon the foundation which is Jesus Christ; instead of a strong and beautiful Church built of the pure gold and silver and precious stones of divine truth, we see the frail and unsightly wood, hay and stubble, as an exhibition of the Temple of God. Hence all the doctrines of the divine word may be viewed as fundamental in their relation to the system of divine truth; for while some are fundamental with respect to the salvation of the soul, all are fundamental with respect to a right knowledge and faith of the word. The Evangelical Lutheran Church recognizes the importance of this principle more fully than any other portion of Protestantism, as the extent of her symbolical books apparently attests. Her confessions declare her faith in regard to every important doctrine that is taught in the divine word, and her position is clearly and fully defined in the great controversies of the Church, respecting the faith once delivered to the saints.

b. Doctrinal Basis of the General Synod. The doctrinal basis of our General Synod, as a human ordinance in the Church, seems practically to represent the subjective faith of the entire Evangelical Lutheran Church in its antithesis to those doctrines which especially mark and identify the Roman Church and the Reformed denominations; without, however, representing the positive faith which particularly characterizes the Evangelical Lutheran Church and which distinguishes it from the various denominations of Christendom; for in withholding its assent to all the symbolical books, as a correct explanation and defence of the doctrines taught in the Augsburg Confession, it implies that its phrase "fundamental doctrines," refers only to doctrines which are fundamental to salvation, and not

to doctrines which are fundamental to a right understanding of divine truth as represented in all the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession. The ethical defence of the doctrinal basis of the General Synod is, that it rightly represents the subjective faith of its adherents, who, on the one hand, cannot conscientiously assent to a Roman or Reformed confession of faith, but on the other hand, are unprepared to accept the doctrines which especially identify the Church of the unaltered Augsburg Confession. As an organ of providence the General Synod has occupied a conspicuous sphere in the development of our Church in this land. Such, however, is the importance of the doctrines exhibited and confessed in all the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in their relation to the entire system of truth revealed in the divine word; such is the unwillingness of the General Synod to affirm the error of those Symbols in its doctrinal basis; and such is the desirability of positive, accurate and definite faith respecting them; that it would seem to be a just inference that the true vocation of the General Synod, not unmindful of her external development and devotional life, is, the determination of the truth or error of those doctrines which it is yet unprepared to confess and defend. Such a calling is indicated by tendencies in the Evangelical Lutheran Church to withhold pulpit and altar fellowship from those who do not confess the doctrines of the divine word as they are taught in her symbolical books. Thus in reply to the question, whether all who live in the Church are to be admitted to the Holy Supper? Gerhard, (x. 381) says: "Nor are all Christians promiscuously to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; but according to the rule of Paul, only those who examine themselves, 1 Cor. 11: 28, *i. e.* those who condemn themselves, v. 31: those who distinguish the body of the Lord from ordinary food, v. 29; and who show forth the Lord's death, v. 26. * * Therefore all those are excluded who are either unwilling or unable to examine themselves, as (1) those who are defiled with heresy, *i. e.* who pertinaciously and refractorily persevere in error concerning the foundation of the faith, neglecting all kinds of admonition; for, since by their heresy they cut themselves off from the fellowship of the true Church

they also cannot at all be admitted to the Sacraments, which are the blessings peculiar to the Church; such are, *e. g.*, those who pertinaciously deny the true and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper. Matt. 7:6; Phil. 3:2; 1 Cor. 11:29."*

This exclusiveness is to be regarded as a manifestation of the confidence of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, in all her symbols as correct exhibitions of divine truth, and of her fidelity to guard its purity. Hence her "close communion" is not so much a challenge as an appeal, to those "who are nigh," as well as "to those who are afar off," "to search" and "try" her symbols of faith, either to prove that they are built upon the treacherous sands of error, or else to learn that they abide upon the enduring rock of truth.

c. The Augsburg Confession. This year, distinguished as the sabbatic year of jubilee in the history of the Augsburg Confession, the oldest of denominational creeds, finds that symbol yet abiding in the bloom and vigor of its youth. In its eventful experience of seven semi-centennials, it has passed through fire and flood, and like our Lord, whose person and work it teaches us rightly to apprehend, it has often been, as to its integrity, despised and rejected of men, yet it survives to-day with more adherents than are claimed by all other creeds of Protestantism combined. Containing in the germ those doctrines which are more fully developed throughout the symbolical books, it seems to be the first necessary basis, upon which our Evangelical Zion can hope to realize an organic unity of faith. Indeed, says Rev. Dr. Krauth, in the introduction to his translation of the Augsburg Confession: "To it the eyes of all deep thinkers have been turned as to a star of hope amid the internal strifes of nominal Protestantism." He then quotes Gieseler, the great Reformed Church historian, as saying: "If the question be, which among all Protestant confessions is best adapted for forming the foundation of a union among Protestant Churches, we declare ourselves unreservedly for the Augsburg Confession." As the *Magna Charta* of the Reformation, as the symbol of

*Quoted in Schmid's *Dogmatic*, Drs. Hay and Jacobs' trans., p. 292.

faith for forty millions of the Protestant Church, as a clear and correct exhibition of those doctrines of the divine word of which it treats, the Augsburg Confession must ever stand pre-eminent among the human ordinances instituted in the visible Church.

We began, in the order of our discussion of specific human ordinances in the Church, with the consideration of the institution of the Lord's day; we end with that of the Augsburg Confession. If there is a relative value and importance among human ordinances in the Church, we may say of these two, that they are the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end; they are the bright and morning stars. Yet we may not undervalue any human ordinance in the Church, established in conformity with the principles enjoined in the fifteenth article of the Augustana, "for as the body is not one member but many," 1 Cor. 13:14, "and the head cannot say to the feet I have no need of you," so it must be said of every human ordinance rightly instituted in the Church, as has been already said of the value of every doctrine taught in the divine word, that "the whole body is fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part." Eph. 4:16.

ARTICLE II.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

By GEO. DIEHL. D. D., Frederick, Md.

In the training and government of the Church, rules and regulations are necessary. The application of these rules and principles derived from divine authority, is called church discipline. These methods of governing are chiefly educational. But in the case of offenders, they may become punitive. The application of such a system of rules is designed to promote the piety, purity, peace and good order of the Church, and the usefulness and final salvation of her members.

Discipline also embraces the methods of regulating public worship and the general management of congregational affairs. Offenders against the canons of the Church, after a fair investigation and impartial decision are visited with penalties, graded according to the offence. The purity of the body sometimes requires cutting off, from all fellowship, the incorrigible; as the Church cannot be responsible for the grossly immoral or the flagrantly heretical. Government in the Church is as necessary as in the state or the family. It is salutary to the subject of discipline and necessary to the welfare of the body exercising it.

WHAT ARE THE AIMS OF CHURCH DISCIPLINE?

The statements above have partly answered this question. In the wide sense of the phrase the object of discipline is the religious improvement of her members, and the prosperity and efficiency of the congregation.

The Church is the visible body of Christ; the witness of His redeeming power on earth; an organization of people confessing the name of Christ and holding forth among men the word of life. In training her people for eternal blessedness the Church becomes an oratory for prayer, a school for conscience, a nursery of goodness. Discipline and government must always

contemplate the advancement of the people in Christian knowledge and holiness. Those who conform to her requirements, obeying her regulations, attending her ordinances and leading exemplary lives require no exercise of disciplinary supervision, being loyal citizens of the kingdom and obedient subjects of grace.

There are three classes over whom the Church should exercise disciplinary influences. The ultimate aim in each case is the same, though varying in the immediate object to be reached.

The first class of members requiring disciplinary training are baptized minors, whose names are enrolled as part of the visible Church. No punitive discipline can be exercised over these even if they grossly violate their baptismal obligations. It has been justly remarked that the entire body of the visible Church—or the entire membership of the baptized—cannot be convened to investigate and decide a case of discipline should there be an accusation of vice or heresy against a baptized youth, who is not in sacramental communion. This entire body has no organization. And no part of a body can feel authorized to act for the whole. There may be persons in the visible Church who are leading the most scandalous lives; but being non-communicants there is no organization of the entire Christian community, that is, persons who have received Christian baptism, to call to an account for immorality or heresy, those who have never sought for admission to the holy communion.

Again, the Church cannot directly exercise authority over minors, since God has entrusted this power to parents and guardians. Paul says (Gal. 4:1, 2): "The heir as long as he is a child differeth nothing from a servant though he be lord of all; but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father." The apostle here teaches that children so long as they are minors, are under the absolute control of parents, whose authority is supreme. This authority children are commanded to recognize and obey. (Col. 3:20): "Children obey your parents in all things; for this is pleasing to God."

There can be no conflict of authority given by divine appointment. There cannot be two jurisdictions that might come

into collision. The scriptural injunction to obey parents precludes the idea of the Church interfering directly between the parent and the child. Nothing can be done that would set aside or weaken the authority of the parent. But the parent being a member, the Church has jurisdiction over him, and through him, indirectly, over the child. The Church can demand that the baptized child be trained in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Baptized minors have entered into covenant relations which bind them to the service of God. This duty should be impressed upon their minds from the earliest unfolding of their powers. The doctrines, facts and duties of the Christian religion should be carefully instilled. Their relations to the Church and the Saviour should be unfolded to their view. Habits of devotion should be fostered. Daily prayer, the reading of the scriptures and attendance upon church services, should be pressed upon their consciences. Evil tendencies in the child should be corrected. He should be guarded against the formation of habits of profanity, falsehood, dishonesty and other youthful vices. He should be continually warned against the snares that lie around the pathway of childhood. Having been consecrated to God, and that without his own consent, at an age too early to comprehend moral and spiritual duties, he has the strongest claim upon parents and the Church for a religious training that will enable him to fulfill his baptismal obligations. The Church is remiss if she does not use her authority over the parent to secure the requisite religious education, teaching the baptized child to kneel in prayer, to be instructed by family influences in the great duties of piety, to be sent to the catechetical class, and to have around the minor the attractive influences of Christian warning and guidance all along the course of childhood and youth. This duty is not limited to the parent. Ministers, church officers, Sunday-school teachers and pious associates are under obligation to the baptized child, that he may be encouraged, or solicited, or admonished, or warned, as the case may require. The Church should not forget that he is an immortal and responsible being, in the most critical period of life when a character will be formed that will probably shape his

career in this world and his destiny in the world to come,—a period also when it will be easy to turn his feet into the way of morality and religion. The child should be so disciplined by sacred influences, at home, in the school and in the sanctuary, that piety becomes easy by reason of the scriptural culture of all these graces which have thus grown into habits. When such a youth evinces a disposition or tendency to the neglect of religion or to immorality, he should be admonished. "Thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor and not suffer sin upon him." This command is as applicable to the case of youth as those of riper years.

This kind of disciplinary training is not limited to youth. If in mature life the baptized are living in manifest violation of their baptismal promises, they should be solicited or warned that their eternal interests already imperiled may not be hopelessly ruined. The error so prevalent, that no special obligation rests on baptized persons to serve God, until a profession of religion is made in adult age, should be dispelled. The current sentiment on this point should be changed by sound instruction from the pulpit, in the family, and in the general tone of religious conversation. If a young communicant should commit some immoral act like drunkenness, his brethren would feel under obligation to rescue him from his spiritual danger by gentle warnings and appeals. Yet if a baptized youth not a communicant should be guilty of the same scandalous conduct, the members of the church seem not to realize a responsibility of disciplinary efforts for his reformation, as though the non-communicant were at liberty to break every precept of the gospel. These two young persons are both in the Church. The one made a solemn promise in baptism to renounce the devil and his works and be a follower of the Christ. The other made the same promise and renewed it. The Church received in the name of her great Head the promises of both. On what principle then can Christ's people shirk the responsibility of warning the erring youth who has never appeared at the sacramental table, but has made through his representatives the most sacred promises that can bind a human being to the throne of God and the cross of Christ?

Another class whose religious improvement should be sought by disciplinary influences, consists of confirmed members of the Church who have neglected the sacramental communion. Their church membership is in a state of voluntary suspension. They belong not to the sacramental host, not being in full fellowship, at the time, and therefore the altar is not profaned by their conduct. It is true that no punitive discipline can be visited upon them for any error in doctrine or life, because they ask not for that which punitive discipline withholds. It would be a mere farce to bring a formal accusation, before an organized tribunal against a man who for years has absented himself from the Lord's table, even though his conduct be scandalous, with a view to trial, conviction and punishment, when the only penalty the Church can inflict is exclusion from the sacrament, which he voluntarily and perversely abandons.

The discipline in such a case must therefore be limited to appeals and warnings and rebukes not only by the pulpit, but by private personal interviews. There should be combined efforts on the part of church members to recall such wanderers of the flock to the altar of their baptism and their vows before God and men. In private conversation such neglecters of duty should hear from their faithful brethren, the solemn denunciation of a woe upon them that are at ease in Zion. Faithfully, tenderly and affectionately should they be solicited: "Come thou with us. We will do thee good; for the Lord hath spoken good concerning Israel." Whether it would be wise to cite them before the church council for neglecting the holy communion, when they first absent themselves, must depend on circumstances. Even then it could be merely for admonition. But private remonstrance by pastor, elder or fellow member, given in the spirit of a tender solicitude for the highest interests of the admonished person must always be proper and practicable, and therefore always a duty. Warnings should be sounded in the ears of a backslider who has become immoral if perchance he may be saved from a ruin impending.

The other class who are proper subjects of church discipline, for their spiritual safety, consists of communicant members of the Church, who fall into conduct openly immoral, or adopt

sentiments avowedly heretical and yet claim the privileges of communicants. The aim is their reformation or restoration to orthodoxy.

Dr. Dwight says: "The aim of Church discipline is nothing less than the reformation of a lapsed Christian; his peace; his Christian character; his worthy participation of Christian privileges; his recovery of the divine approbation; his future usefulness in this life; his happiness in the life to come, and even his salvation itself are all deeply concerned and sometimes absolutely involved in these administrations. That these are at times accomplished by private remonstrance and public admonition will not be doubted. They may sometimes be accomplished by excommunication."

Another aim of Church discipline, when it becomes punitive whether in suspension or excommunication, is the purity of the Church. By such an act the Church frees herself from all responsibility for the character and conduct of the excommunicated member.

WHAT ARE THE LIMITS TO CHURCH DISCIPLINE ?

The right and duty of Church discipline by private admonition and counsel, are coextensive with the visible Church, embracing all those who neglect the requirements of the gospel. Punitive discipline must be confined to gross offenders, whose errors and vices have become scandalous.

The exercise of this kind of discipline must ever proceed on the basis of the truth taught in the Parable of the Tares:

"The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man which sowed good seed in his field. But while men slept his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up and brought forth fruit then appeared the tares also. So the servants of the householder came and said, wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat. Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather ye first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather ye the wheat into my barn. * * He that soweth the good seed is the

Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathernd and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity. And shall cast them into a furnace of fire. There shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. 13: 24-30 and 37-43). "The field is the world." The world cannot mean the entire population of our globe. The servants of the Great Householder never proposed the ejection from this globe of all evil people. They never had the power to do this. The "world" here must mean the Christian world. The gospel is preached and the Church founded on earth among men. That portion of the human race and the earth represented here as a field, in which wheat and tares are growing side by side, must be the communities to whom the gospel is preached and by whom Christian institutions are recognized—peoples where all bear some resemblance to wheat although a portion are tares. In other words, the cultivated field in which tares and wheat grow intermingled, must represent the nominal Church. This is further evident from his calling this field, or world, "his kingdom." "The reapers shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend." The field in which the wheat and tares grow and out of which, in the end, the tares shall be gathered in bundles and burned, must be the visible Church. This kingdom cannot mean the entire human race, but only those who are embraced in Christian institutions and are, to some extent, under gospel influences.

The truth taught in this parable is, that in the visible Church there will always be good and bad—converted and unconverted persons. The servants of the Master must not attempt to cast out all the bad. They would often be mistaken as to Christian character. The wheat would often be rooted up with the tares.

On this question great theological battles have been fought.

Some have sought to cast out of the visible Church all unregenerate souls. The Donatists in separating from the Church, partly on account of irregularities in certain ordinations, avowedly took the ground that the gospel demanded a strictly pious church. The idea of a church they held was, "that of a perfectly pure body: holiness is its essential predicate, to which all others must be subordinated; the exclusive note of the Church. They did not deny that hypocrites might lie concealed in its bosom; but where the evidently ungodly were suffered to remain in communion with it, not separated off by the exercise of discipline, it forfeited the character of a true church; and the faithful were to come out from it. For remaining in it they would be defiled."

To this the Church catholic, through her great champion, St. Augustine, replied, that "Holiness is indeed one of the essential attributes of the Church; but their idea of holiness could not be accepted. The quality of holiness was found in the Church which the Donatists had forsaken, and was combined with other qualities quite as essential, such as catholicity to which they could lay no claim. The Church, despite all appearances to the contrary, is a holy body, for they are its members who are in true and living fellowship with Christ, and therefore partakers of his sanctifying spirit." Ever since that great religious conflict was waged successfully by that eminent writer, it has been admitted that some who are in the visible Church are not of the spiritual body of Christ. "They press upon Christ as the thronging multitude, but do not touch him as did the believing woman." (Luke 8: 45). "They who are thus in it, but not of the invisible true Church, whether hypocrites, lying hid, or open offenders who from their number may not without greater evils ensuing, be expelled, do not defile the true members as long as these share not in their spirit, and communicate not with their evil deeds." "They are like the unclean animals in the same ark with the clean; goats in the same pasture with the sheep; chaff on the same barn floor with the grain; tares growing in the same field with the wheat, endured for a while, but in the end separated, the evil from the good."

When the Saviour said "Nay" to the servants who asked,

"Shall we root them up?" all such measures for the excision of offenders were condemned, as should "leave them no possibility of after repentance and amendment." Indeed the prohibition is so plain and positive, that some attempts made toward carrying the proposal into execution, appear, says Bengel, to be "not wheat making war on the tares, but tares seeking to root up the wheat."

Again, in rooting out tares, persons who are now impenitent, we might cut off those who will hereafter repent and become the true followers of Christ. Moreover, the servants with the best intentions might be mistaken. What human insight can distinguish between those whose hearts are right in the sight of God and those who are not. The Omniscient alone can look into the soul and know unerringly who are His own.

The reason for the prohibition must be apparent. The Saviour whose omniscient eye swept the whole period of time from the hour of the delivery of this parable to the final consummation when all evil shall be removed from the Church, saw that in all Christian countries, through all the ages of church history, many baptized members would long remain unconverted. As He came to seek and to save the lost, He desired not only the Christianizing of the heathen, but the conversion of the impenitent in Christian lands. If all nominal Christians should be arraigned before the Church, tried and convicted, and cut off as unworthy to be in a holy body, their excision would completely estrange them from Christian people and ordinances. They would be beyond the reach of Christian influences. Hostile toward the Church that had degraded their moral standing, they would not enter the sanctuary. With bitter feelings toward ministers, they would rarely come within the hearing of the gospel. Thus cut off from the hallowing influences of public worship, with strong dislike toward the body that had pronounced them unworthy of fellowship, they would listen to no private admonition from Christians. Their exclusion from the Church in many cases would be nearly equivalent to sealing their damnation.

On the contrary, retained on the roll of nominal members, they feel encouraged to attend public worship and mingle with

Christian people. Their children will be reared under Christian training. All the appeals of the pulpit sound in their ears, and the hallowing associations of the Sabbath and the Sanctuary are acting on their souls. Their contributions flow into the treasury of the Church, and the ordinances of religion receive from them an outward homage. Thus from the ranks of impenitent, but nominal members of the Church accessions are continually made to the true followers of Christ. Indeed for some centuries converts have come chiefly from those already in the Church by baptism, and some by baptism and confirmation. For every convert from heathenism, a thousand come from nominal christendom. No wonder the Master said, "Nay, root them not up."

There is, however, a class of church members against whom the Scriptures authorize the exercise of punitive discipline. One passage sometimes cited in proof of this authority is this, (Matt. 18 : 15-17) "Moreover if thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, take with thee two or three more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it unto the Church. But if he shall neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican."

This passage although generally cited in support of scriptural authority for the exercise of punitive discipline, teaches it only by inference. The case stated is that of a disagreement between two members of the Church, a wrong inflicted by one upon the other; and the duty of seeking a private settlement of the difficulty. If the effort of the brother who feels himself injured, fail to procure an acknowledgment of the error and the righting of the wrong, the interposition of a few mutual friends is to be sought. If this effort at the adjustment of the difficulty should fail the interposition of the Church is to be invoked. Should the judgment of the congregation fail to convince the man of his injury to a fellow member, the wronged person is authorized to withdraw all social and religious association with

his opponent—treat him as the Jews treated the heathen and publicans—have no intercourse with him. The passage does not instruct the Church to proceed farther than this earnest effort at reconciliation by convincing the person that he has wronged a brother, and the reparation that would naturally follow such an admission. It can only be by inference that this passage would authorize the Church to proceed to arraign the unconvincing wrong-doer. Direct authority must therefore be sought in other passages. This we find in the following texts:

Rom. 16:17, 18: "Now I beseech you brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple."

2 Thess. 3:6: "Now we beseech you brethren in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition which he received of us."

Titus 3:10: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject."

1 Cor. 5:10: "Now I have written unto you not to keep company if any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no, not to eat."

1 Cor. 5:4, 5: "In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one unto satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

1 Tim. 1:19, 20: "Holding faith and a good conscience which some have put away, concerning faith have made shipwreck, of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander, whom I have delivered unto satan that they may learn not to blaspheme."

2 Cor. 13:10: "Lest being present I should use sharpness according to the power which the Lord hath given unto me, to edification, and not to destruction."

Every society of men possesses inherently the right to eject

from the body members who prove themselves unworthy by reason of unfitness of character, incongruity of views, incompatibility of disposition, or conduct hostile to the interests of the association. Religious organizations have at all times practiced the excision of the unworthy. The Hindoos, the Ancient Greeks, the Romans, the Jews practiced excommunication. By virtue of the authority given in the passages cited, the Christian Church has also practised it. In ancient times in the middle ages, and in some countries where the Church and State are united in modern times, excommunication has been followed by civil disabilities. But no authority for such penalties can be found in the New Testament.

The first cause or ground of excision is heresy. The reason for this is apparent. One who denies the doctrines of the Saviour cannot properly be a member of his body. Gross violations of the law of chastity, drunkenness and odious vices are named by the apostle as meriting exclusion from the Church.

There is a fitness in the direction to cut off from the holy communion persons whose vices have become so public as to be scandalous in the eyes of the community. The Church cannot receive to her holy altar those who so flagrantly violate not only her canons, but also the common requirements of decency. If private admonition and pulpit remonstrance fail to bring about reformation, the offending member must be cut off from the Eucharist and all the privileges limited to communicants. When the apostle says, he delivered "such unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," we have no data on which to decide the question whether the apostle by his miraculous power inflicted bodily diseases or temporal judgments on Hymeneus, Alexander and the incestuous person to bring them out of their heresies and vices, or whether he intends to express simply exclusion from the holy communion and other privileges limited to communicants; referring to the two kingdoms—the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan, and expulsion from God's kingdom would be a deliverance to the government of Satan. But one thing is certain, whatever power Paul may have exercised over the cure or the infliction of diseases, since the day of

miracles is over, the Church has no scriptural power to make excommunication extend beyond exclusion from sacred and spiritual privileges.

THE DUTY OF ENFORCING DISCIPLINE.

Form of Government, Chap. iv., Sec. 8: "It shall be the duty of the council to administer the Discipline of the Church on all those whose conduct is inconsistent with their Christian profession." "They shall have the power to cite members to appear before them." It shall be their duty first privately to admonish him that offends. If these measures prove ineffectual, to suspend or excommunicate, that is debar from the privileges peculiar to Church membership," those who entertain fundamental errors. "It shall also be their duty to restore those subjects of suspension or excommunication to all the privileges of the Church, who shall manifest sincere repentance. Every act of excommunication or suspension may be published to the Church, if deemed necessary by the majority of the council."

From the preceding scripture citations and the principles laid down, we learn,

That disciplinary training by private appeals, admonitions and warnings is required on behalf of all who are baptized and yet are living in violation of their baptismal covenant;

That the scriptures authorize the excision of such as are scandalously immoral, or flagrantly heretical;

That the apostle inflicted punitive discipline on those who avowed dangerous heresies and wrought schism in the Church, and on those who grossly violated the laws of purity in the family relation;

That the Church must not be responsible for their vices and errors, but must bear testimony against them by excluding from the holy communion the incorrigible;

That there is no scriptural authority for inflicting civil disabilities as part of the penalty;

That the excommunicated are to be restored to forfeited privileges upon satisfactory evidence of repentance and reformation;

That the Church is a holy body, notwithstanding the presence in her of unregenerate persons;

That the influence of the Christian character, conduct and converse of true believers is designed to operate as leaven to leaven the mass of the impenitent. Therefore they are to be encouraged to attend the preaching of the gospel and all the services of public worship, and that excommunication does not debar the excommunicated from the services of the sanctuary, but merely from the Eucharist and the right of voting in congregational elections;

That the design of church discipline must ever be the spiritual improvement of the subject;

That excommunication does not annul the baptismal covenant; and therefore the restored penitent is not to be rebaptized;

That church discipline is to be exercised with the tender affection toward the erring with which a loving mother chastises her offending child, bearing in mind that Christ came to seek and save the lost.

Finally, while the scriptures authorize the sterner discipline of an accusation and trial before the church in extreme cases, the ancient venerable Lutheran practice of requiring all communicants to have an interview with the pastor prior to the communion, obviated the necessity of resorting to the more public measures of a trial with all the scandal and heartburnings that such a trial almost inevitably occasions. If this practice were resumed and faithfully carried out, the erring would be most earnestly and affectionately warned or admonished; usually brought to repentance, and if necessary kept from the sacrament without inflicting the pain and mortification which the usual modes of discipline in some churches create. The holy communion would be kept pure. The pastor's power for good would be augmented. The erring would in most cases be brought to an acknowledgment of his evil, and won back to a life of purity and the service of the church. His relatives would be spared the bitter mortifications that usually attend public discipline and often drive them from the church. And the prosperity of the congregation would be greatly promoted.

ARTICLE III.

THE COLLEGE.

By REV. CHAS. S. ALBERT, A. M., Carlisle, Pa.

A great deal of attention has lately been given to education in its lower and higher departments. It has been called forth by the importance of the change in intellectual thought so manifest in our day. The idea which lies at the heart of the controversy is, after all, whether education shall be religious or not in the future?

The friends and enemies of Christianity know well the vantage ground which education confers, and each seeks to prepossess, by its system of training, the youthful mind towards its principles. Stripped of verbiage, this is the end of all the argument, the point towards which all go. Youth is the receptive period of life, maturity the creative. Youth worships, maturity deliberates; youth receives the impulse, maturity makes the impulse reality—not invariably so, but to such an extent that we may safely let the division stand. It is therefore of incalculable value to place our children where they may be impressed with the best thought. The best thought is a large word. To one who believes the best thought refers also to the moral nature of man, it is not enough to have the best intellectual thought. If no other considerations were to be taken into account except knowledge and method, a father would be wise who sends his son of scientific bent to the College, or University, which would give him the most thorough training in his specialty. But there are other considerations to be taken into account, to be seriously weighed in selecting a College for a young man not established in character. It is not enough that it is specially adapted for his peculiar calling, or profession. It may not seem so to those who do not believe that character and worth are founded upon a belief in God, but it certainly does appear so to those who so believe. Moral influence must be considered.

"Education is properly the development of the whole man. The whole person is to be educated; but the main subject of the work is the spirit. Education is the nurture and development of the whole man for his proper end. The end must be conceived aright in order to understand the process. Every man's earthly end is predominantly moral; and, therefore, we find all ages and all nations declaring their belief that there can be no true education without the inculcation of true religion."

Webster in his celebrated speech against the Girard will, argued that the trust it proposed to create was opposed to all civilized jurisprudence, outside of the law and therefore void, because it sought to exclude Christianity from the College. "In what age," he said, "by what sect, where, when, by whom has religious truth been excluded from the education of youth? Nowhere. Never! Everywhere and at all times it has been regarded as essential. It is of the essence, the vitality of useful instruction."

It may be argued also, that whilst culture without any definite purpose sends forth men imperfectly equipped for life's pursuits, it is none the less true that special courses and special pursuits not based upon general education are justly censured by thinking men, as tending to narrowness, weakness and failure. "Culture for culture's sake not only fails to prepare for definite pursuits so necessary in the complexly organized modern society, but fails even to attain the brightest culture; since culture must terminate outwardly on some definite object, not inwardly upon itself, in order to attain its highest point. On the other hand a pure intellectual apprenticeship to special pursuits not only fails to give that general culture so necessary to enable us to perform wisely the complex duties consequent upon our moral relations to each other in the family, the Church, and the State, but fails even to insure really high success in the special business which is its immediate object; for special education without thorough foundation of general culture can make only *routinists*, formula men, rule-of-thumb men."*

General culture based upon religious thought ought to enter

*Joseph Le Conte, *Princeton Review*, March, 1880, page 180.

into our calculation of the respective merits of Colleges. We guard the opening years of our children sedulously. We do our utmost to inculcate virtue, to repress vice, to build up a conscientious character towards God and man. When, therefore, the judgment is not matured, when there is not the trained reason to detect falsehood and sophistry, when experience has not shown the eternal verities of truth, in the formative stage of life, to send our sons to anti-Christian Colleges, or, to those, some or many of whose chairs are filled by professors notoriously sceptical, is to subject them to perilous danger. The young man with heart all open and mind grasping eagerly after knowledge will take indiscriminately into his soul things good and bad to grow into a harvest of how much misery, we know not. Belief possesses a man and rules him. It must out; consciously and unconsciously, he will proclaim it and in direct proportion to his strength of belief, for belief is the foundation of all influence, character, power and work. The professor who disbelieves in God and hates Christianity will inculcate his faith, sometimes the more strongly because unconsciously he is quietly contemptuous and proudly arrogant towards religion. A sneer is harder to meet than an argument with youth. Every strong intellectual man placed over burning, diffident, worshiping youth, is a Magnus Apollo to be reverenced and obeyed.

Such considerations have a profound bearing on the selection of a College. Attention has lately been called to Yale College. "It is well known that the Evolutionary theory in its baldest form is taught from one of the scientific chairs in the College, and now another of the professors has caused his colleagues much anxiety, and introduced a serious division in the Faculty by teaching and defending the principles of Herbert Spencer. Spencer, it is well known, is the chief of the Agnostics, and believes that the universe is without God, at least is without a God that can be known to man. 'He holds,' as one says, 'that all systems of religion will ultimately disappear, and be succeeded by a vague belief in an infinitely remote and incomprehensible cause.' Prof. Sumner, of the College, teaches Spencer's principles of Sociology, using one of Spencer's vol-

umes as his text-book, and continues this against the advice and remonstrance of President Porter."

There lies the danger. We are asked to send our young men, unformed, "to walk in the counsel of the ungodly, to stand in the way of sinners and *to sit in the seat of the scornful.*" The value of our own Church Colleges with sound religious foundations has been enhanced by these developments and their claims for support are shown to be just and legitimate, for they at least strive to preserve purity of faith in their teachings.

Nevertheless there are other factors entering into the choice of an intellectual home for our sons. Granted that the determination has been in favor of an institution of sound religious basis, selection would not necessarily be in favor of our own Alma Mater, even among General Synod Lutherans. Another element would enter into the choice. There would be a desire to send young men to the strongest College as well as to a worthy one. This leads us to say that one of the characteristics of a strong College is *strong men*, intellectually. This fact ought to be recognized and met by the Church and professors in Church Colleges. Strong institutions are built upon able men. Men attract more than appliances or wealth of endowment. Masters always secure a following. Luther and Melanchthon peopled Wittenberg with students. The man is more than the book. Written words weaken the power of thought. Words give precision to thought, and embody the idea, but, when written, always in their stiffness and coldness lose the subtler shades of meaning, which the voice, tone and manner convey. Text-books always are less than the writers. The inspiration of presence, that so fires the listener and infuses into his soul life-purposes, is not there. Strong men are like the glowing fire at which another's torch may be lit. They create in their students the same invincible desire for knowledge that possesses them. It was Plato and not Athens that gave to him the noble following. To-day in Germany the current sets towards the Universities most ably manned. Men are the magnets. Clearly then the duty of the professors is not merely to hold forth the moral advantages of Church Colleges, but to so fill

their respective chairs, that they shall compare favorably with others, and excel as leaders of thought. The professor it is true must always be able to impart the knowledge he possesses, else he lacks a most essential requisite, the teaching power, but he ought in addition to be a master of his department, revered in the intellectual world. Second-rate men will never be able to hold the best of young men, when first-rate men are offering to lead spirited and talented men to the sunny heights of knowledge which they have won by painful climbing.

Right over against this, as a second element of a strong College, is *adequate support of instructors and institution*. Brains have their price. Every professor of ability will always be wanted, and to retain them they must be suitably compensated. It is but just that he should live freed from petty anxieties for daily bread and shelter. It is necessary that his income be such as will enable him to purchase books, apparatus and appliances to prosecute his studies. He should be able to attend and participate in the deliberations of all bodies which meet to discuss the subjects in which he is interested. He could thus easily keep abreast of the best and freshest of modern thought. Our professors are in truth miserably paid. They have a bare living, if that. The able and efficient men who continue to serve do so at a sacrifice, praiseworthy in itself, but which the Church has no right to demand, whilst in days past, Pennsylvania College has seen some most noble instructors leave, who, in other institutions, have made names and reputations almost world-wide. Pennsylvania College has advanced somewhat in its appliances, but is sadly behindhand for want of funds. The magnificent structures, the great libraries, the splendidly furnished departments of other Colleges place her at a great disadvantage, and attract from her the young men who ought to be educated in her own halls.

It does seem that there is scarcely a greater, or more promising opportunity for rich men wisely to use their wealth than in the endowment of their own institutions. The opening of this article maintained that a man is not truly educated whose brain alone is cultivated; that the moral and religious nature being the loftiest and noblest part of the man, should be developed

with his body and intellect. The teachings of our own Lutheran Church are able to do this, some of us think, better than any other phase of Christian religion.

The advantages, again, of skilled religious thought are well known. Whatever may be the experience of faith, it is always joined to its historical foundation. Attacks upon its historical character, paraded with much learning, are far more deadly than arguments addressed to the reason. It is the age of Apologetics and there is need of profound scholarship and research to explode the theories of those who attack the historical validity of the scriptures and of those who, in the name of science, profound anti-theistic, anti-Christian theories.

Men may deeply feel the truth of the Christian religion, be confident of its worth, yet, because the battle has been shifted to unknown fields, may not be able to defend it against the attacks of the scholarly skeptic. Those established in the faith may not be moved, but the younger generation, if there were no refutation, would be captivated by the seeming wisdom displayed, become skeptical concerning the faith and finally lost to it. When the faith has men of skilled thought, capacious intellect trained to reason and supported by knowledge as various and extensive, if not more so, as that of skeptics, the danger is lessened. They are ever the light-bringers to a darkened world. The rays of knowledge expose the hypocrisies, the self-deceptions of error. Their sagacious fore-thought predicts and declares the disastrous outcomes into which infidelity will issue. Eve in her dreams may listen to Satan, and be enraptured with their beauty, but the touch of Ithuriel's spear discloses him in all his vileness. The spear of truth wielded by skilled hearts and intellects can alone reveal the dangerous consequences of many fascinating dreams of modern thought. We owe, under God, to the keen intellect of Paul the deliverance of the Church from Judaistic errors. When "Satan transformed himself into an angel of light" in the person of "false apostles and deceitful workers," he with the truth made them manifest to the Church and saved her from destruction. The Church needs men like Paul to-day, and she should be willing to support them.

It has been permitted our wealthy men to acquire riches by

the exercise of talents no less marked, in their way, than those of the scholar. Perhaps the fertility of mind, the quickness of perception, the keen insight into men and circumstances, the sound judgment, the strong self-restraint, the tireless work of the business man might, under suitable conditions, have made him the scholar. What better use of wealth than to liberally endow the College by which it may be equipped in the great contest against wrong? If Frederick of Saxony had not founded the University of Wittenberg, using his riches for the spread of knowledge, would the world have had Luther and the Reformation? And though the people groaned under error, if this brave, keen-sighted scholar had not been their mouthpiece, would error have been exposed and the Church reformed?

Unbelieving men, holding that knowledge is power, found Colleges and Universities, or obtain possession of State Universities, that these may be the champions of godless thought. It is an example to us who believe that truth and the religion of Christ are necessary to our peace and happiness, as individuals, as communities, as a nation, that if these give immense sums to such institutions, we should at least be equally liberal and so endow our Church Colleges that they may without disadvantage compete with them.

There is another element of a strong College which it is well to consider. It is NUMBERS. There is no desire to undervalue small Colleges, or depreciate the good work done by them in the past, but numbers have a vital relation, both to endowment and also to able professors.

It is difficult to interest men in Colleges whose outlook is meagre, since they have a right to a small territory only, and have no prospect of growth and commanding influence. It looks to shrewd men like a waste of money to endow such institutions. Besides a College, with a circumscribed field, has in the nature of things few men of means and liberality to draw upon for endowment.

Able men, again, are not plentiful so that excellent instructors cannot be found to constitute the many faculties of struggling institutions each with a poverty-stricken roll of students. It must ever remain a great temptation to a gifted man, placed

over a handful of students, to leave them for wider fields of usefulness; for the same effort and teaching may be given to a hundred students as well as to ten with tenfold result for labor.

There are certain facts which we ought to face as a Church. First, the number of students have not kept pace with the increase in membership, indicating that either as Lutherans, we have not to-day as many educated young men relatively as in the past; or that many of the young are educated in other institutions and are imbibing opinions and traditions which in the end will lead them out of the Church of their fathers. There has been nothing sadder in the history of the college life of our Church, than its endless divisions and sub-divisions. Disintegration has been the rule. College after College has been established on mere whim and fancy, until there are many weak, struggling institutions, slimly attended, imperfectly equipped, in financial straits as a normal condition, inadequately manned. Some of our institutions do not deserve the name of College. The Church might have had a great University, strong in numbers, ably and efficiently conducted, if forbearance had been practiced, and if conceited and arrogant individualism had not thrust itself across this great work and prostrated it.

Much may be done to strengthen the numbers of students by united and persevering effort. Numbers have power. They bring inspiration to the teacher, incentive to labor. Mind quickens mind as multitudes mingle. A just and noble spirit of pride is engendered that makes every student a joyous herald of his Alma Mater. Numbers are a mighty voice to the world proclaiming the vigor and power of the College. One attracts another. Every reputation made is a new argument to men to send their sons. The influence continues in after life. The nation is practical and men readily see that the graduates of large institutions like Harvard find it always to their advantage afterwards, giving them friends, influence, character, position. It has its weight.

A College to secure numbers must be broad and generous in its culture. It ought not to be a mere nursery of theological fledglings. Every profession and employment ought to find in its bosom a home. It is as much a matter of rejoicing to num-

ber, among the illustrious sons of a College, a skilled surgeon, a distinguished physician, a wise statesman, a great poet, a profound lawyer, an able editor, a skillful scientist, as to write upon her roll of honor the name of an eminent theologian, for they may be as useful to the maintenance of the truth as he. There is need then of broad culture which will provide suitable facilities for each and every calling.

This leads us to the last element of a strong College we shall mention, *adaptation to the wants of the day*. Latin and Greek in the middle ages, at the time of the revival of letters, contained the great treasures of knowledge. It was natural, therefore, that an extraordinary amount of study should be given to these languages, for through them the wisdom of the ages could be acquired. The modern mind did not simply learn what they knew, but began its own independent investigations and has added immense treasures of learning, especially in the natural sciences. The claim is now put forward that whilst Latin and Greek were essential a century ago that they are not as necessary to-day as these new sciences, and that the continuance of the classics in all their integrity is unwise. It is better, it is claimed, to give them a much more limited course, or even none at all, and devote the energies to the studies which are useful in active life, namely to mathematics, natural philosophy, chemistry, physiology or biology, and mental philosophy.

The adherents of the classical course argue that the aim of college instruction is, to make man a thinker, to broaden his understanding, to develop his reasoning powers and to direct his intellect to the best methods of discipline. The modern revolutionists hold that the purpose of education is to qualify the student for a particular profession by imparting the knowledge, the methods of study, the facts that are essential and fundamental to progress in the selected branch of knowledge. The controversy, into which we have not space to enter, seems destined to be harmonized by a combination of the two theories, to meet in a curriculum which will give intellectual discipline and, at the same time, fit men for the particular professions in which they wish to engage.

The result is that the curriculum of the College is not satis-

factory; it may have met the wants of our ancestors, it does not meet the wants of the present generation. Therefore, if the College is to be strong, it must seek to gratify the demands of the times. Colleges are conservators of thought and should not lightly yield time honored counsels or methods. Colleges should be more than conservators, they should be leaders of thought. Bourbonism in literature is as deadly as in politics, and the end of both is loss of power and ruin. *Adaptation to the wants of the day* is therefore necessary to a vigorous College. The problem must be carefully examined, with laborious study; it must be met courageously and, if necessary, prejudice must be sacrificed in its settlement. An extension of the college course proper may be required which would not be harmful, for the work of many Colleges is very superficial, even in the classics themselves. An able metaphysician lately said in a conversation with us: "When I determined to make metaphysics my life-work, I saw that Latin was absolutely necessary. My college training had given me the rudiments, but to obtain a thorough and accurate knowledge of the language that I might critically use it, required hard study for a long time. Latin conquered, I perceived I must be thoroughly acquainted with German. I therefore spent several years in Germany until I learned the language. I confess that though I have since given so much attention to Greek as to read it readily at sight, I have not that command of it, by which I easily detect the shades of meaning in words and phrases which is the very thing most needful."

A more thorough training, a broader curriculum, a higher standard of scholarship seems to be demanded of Colleges. We need to consider the whole matter carefully as it holds much woe or weal to the Church. We ought to have the very strongest College possible, and spare neither toil, men, nor means, until it be accomplished, that men, "rooted and grounded in the faith," may be sent forth into the world admirably qualified for whatever profession they may choose, and equally trained to be champions of the cross.

ARTICLE IV.

SOME OF THE PRIVATE COLLOQUIES AND PUBLIC DISPUTATIONS OF LUTHER.

By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D., Baltimore, Md.

Among the many daring and dangerous efforts made by Luther to restore the pure doctrine and to reform the abuses of the Church, his religious discussions deserve conspicuous mention. The variety of these conferences, the distinguished and influential men with whom they were held, the burning zeal for the truth which he displayed in them, his deep anxiety for peace and unity, the learning, the logical acumen and controversial skill he exhibited, all command our attentive consideration.

There is no doubt that some controversies in the Church have resulted in unmixed evil and injury to the cause of truth and righteousness, instances of which will readily occur to intelligent minds, beginning with the dispute which our mother Eve held with the enemy of mankind, which "brought death into the world and all our woe." But still, truth will only triumph by persistently controverting error and error will not succumb without a struggle. Our Lord himself engaged in public disputations with the learned theological errorists of his day, although he knew beforehand that He would not accomplish His wish to gain them over to the gospel, but His design was to rebuke their audacity and paralyze their mischievous influence by "stopping their mouths." Nearly the whole of Paul's Christian life was one of almost ceaseless controversy with Hebrew theologians and Greek philosophers, and thus, through every age of the Church, the truth has been compelled literally to fight its way and the necessity of theological disputation will only cease when all Christians shall be "perfectly joined together in the same mind."

The history of the Reformation swarms with instances in which the long obscured truth was again restored to light and

extended by disputations, and especially by the academic controversies of Luther. He was not naturally inclined to this service but the terrible corruptions of the Church compelled him to employ this mode of warfare, for he could not accomplish his exalted purpose by letters or preaching. Heaven had endowed him with extraordinary gifts as a disputant, a keen discrimination and wonderful faculty for discerning the weak points of his opponents, a never failing memory, an uninterrupted fluency of speech, an amazing knowledge of Scripture, a coolness of temper amid the most vigorous onslaught, and an unshaken confidence in the righteousness of his cause, which rendered his verbal discussions refreshing to every unprejudiced hearer.*

It was however not only in his public disputations with his Romish adversaries, that he displayed these remarkable powers, but, in his colloquies and conferences with Protestant theologians the same high qualities were exhibited.

It is my purpose to portray some of these, and the beginning shall be made with those of a more private character, although this word is not to be understood as if no persons were present except the disputants, but that they were not held in public and were not the result of open challenges as was the case with those best known, or rather they were not openly announced.

By *Colloquies or Conferences* as they were called, I mean those discussions which he held with men of his own faith before he formally cut himself loose from Rome. They were a sort of family meetings, held for the purpose of settling difficulties in the household. Some of them were held with individuals, such as his colloquy with Cajetan, Miltitz and others, and they were comparatively private; others were of a more public character, such as that held at Heidelberg. The conference with Zwingli some years after (1529) was rather of a private nature, though a considerable number of persons were present.

By *Disputations* I mean those open, oral discussions which

*"Mira ejus in respondendo suavitas, in audiendo incomparabilis longanimitas: in dissolvendo Paulli agnoscet acumen, non Scoti, adeo brevibus, equo divinæ Scripturæ pena depromptis responsis in sui admirationem facile cunctos adduxit," Bucer.

he held with the adherents of Rome, which were publicly advertised and attended by crowds of hearers, such as that, for instance, with Eck, at Leipzig, in 1519.

COLLOQUY AT HEIDELBERG.

The first conference in which Luther took an active part was that of the Augustinians at Heidelberg in 1518, which he attended as a brother of the Order, and here he displayed heroic courage. It had some of the features of a public controversy, but after all it is to be properly ranked among the conferences. In the previous year (1517) he had taken a perilous step in the publication of his ninety-five propositions and hence was abominated by every zealous papist as a heretic and an enemy of the Christian Church, although he was yet in full communion with Rome. He had a long journey to make from Wittenberg to Heidelberg, upon which he was exposed to every possible peril of his life and he was vehemently urged by his friends not to undertake it. But our hero, relying upon the protection of God, calmly entered upon his journey, and on foot, at least as far as Würzburg. He was highly honored at Heidelberg, and was entertained at the Augustinian convent. He was even kindly received by the Pfaltzgrave Wolfgang* and other dignitaries and invited to their tables. He was shown all the costly jewels and other precious and wonderful curiosities of the famous castle.

Twenty-eight theological and twenty-two philosophical propositions called *paradoxes* were the subjects of discussion. They were thus designated because they were singular, or apparently incapable of being believed. In the theological theses, he refuted the errors of the Church of Rome on Free Will, Grace, Faith, Justification and Good Works, and repeated his propositions against Indulgences. Those on philosophy, were all directed against Aristotle. They were all publicly nailed up at a conspicuous place, and on April 26 the discussion was opened by Luther and his respondent Leonhard Beyer. It was not held

*He had studied at Wittenberg, and in 1515 he was Rector of the University.

in the auditorium of the University, because the professors of theology opposed it, but in the Augustinian cloister. There was a great crowd of students, citizens and courtiers. Not only did the learned monks take part but also the five professors of theology. Luther in a letter to Spalatin, speaks well of four, but the youngest set the whole house in a roar by exclaiming to Luther, "If the peasants heard you talk in that style they would stone you to death." The doctrines of Luther were strange to the ignorant theologians of those days! Bucer, Brentz, Schnepf, Billican, and other eminent theologians were present. Bucer wrote down the greater part of Luther's words. The Pfaltzgrave wrote to the Elector lauding Luther, very highly for his skill and learning displayed in the discussion, and offering him all official protection. Luther did not return on foot as he came, but in a carriage with others.

If this colloquy had resulted in nothing better than in displaying the extraordinary gifts and great acquirements of Luther and thus securing the favor of the Pfaltzgrave, it would have been enough.

The protection of this wise and powerful prince was important to him. But another inappreciable advantage resulted from it. Luther needed helpers in his mighty enterprise of overturning popery in so many kingdoms and states. To this end, this conference contributed essentially. The men mentioned above became his hearty co-adjudors. Twenty-eight years afterwards (1546) the city of Heidelberg itself petitioned the Elector Frederick to introduce the religion of the Reformation.

CONFERENCE WITH CAJETAN.

It was in the same year 1518, that Luther held a colloquy with Cardinal Cajetan, the papal legate, at Augsburg, which must be regarded as the most momentous and perilous of all, not only for his personal safety but also for the Church which was now painfully sighing for a reformation.

He came to Augsburg without an imperial safe conduct, or government protection and he was there three days without it. Cajetan, his bitterest enemy, was aware of this. This crafty Italian was anxious to take advantage of this fact. He sent to

Luther every day and employed every means to induce him to come to an interview, before he had received the safe conduct. If Luther had allowed himself to be thus entrapped, the cardinal would have accomplished his cunning design. Either Luther would have been compelled to recant, or if he had refused, he would have been sent to Rome in chains, where short work would have been made of him. But Providence guarded our hero against the artful pitfalls prepared for him. He yielded to the persuasions of his friends not to appear before the cardinal, until he had furnished him with the imperial document guaranteeing his personal safety. Even after he had received it he was not exempt from danger. As papal legate, the cardinal exercised great authority and influence, and would have concerned himself little about the document, could he have gotten Luther into his power by violence or cunning artifice.

When it was by authority announced to him that Luther had received the paper from the emperor, and that the cardinal should not employ forcible means against him, he is said to have declared, "It is well, I will do what my office requires."*

After Luther had appeared before him three times and would not consent to a recantation, the cardinal peremptorily forbade his presence thereafter. He said, "I will have nothing more to do with this wild beast, for he has deep piercing eyes and wonderful thoughts flit through his head." Luther wrote to him requesting another interview, but he received no answer. This aroused suspicion in the minds of Luther's friends. The report was circulated that the pope had given Cajetan permission to seize and imprison him, if he would not recant. The legate wrote to Rome for instructions and who knows what would have been the consequence, if Luther had waited until the answer had been received from Rome. He left Augsburg but not secretly,† according to the advice of his friends, after he

*Luther's own account of this affair may be seen in the Preface to the second part of the Jena edition of his works. A German translation will be found as a Preface to Part VIII. of the Altenberg edition.

†Lampadius, a Reformed writer, tries to show that Luther fled from Augsburg secretly, but he has been refuted by Höe in his *Apologia pro Lutherio*.

had sent to his persecutor a written appeal, and waited from Sunday to Tuesday night for a reply.

Cajetan did not adhere to the proposed subject of the Colloquy, which was, "The doctrine of Indulgences and the disgraceful proceedings of Tetzel." If he had conducted the affair discreetly and made some concessions himself, he might have secured the same from his opponent, for he was willing to yield on some points but the cardinal did not touch the subject, for he was well aware that he could not uphold it. On the contrary, he brought up some other presumed errors of Luther on faith and grace and thus craftily avoided the real issue.

Maimbourg, Eck and other Romish writers acknowledge that Cajetan failed entirely in this conference with Luther, but we must not attribute the fact that the Reformation was more promoted than retarded, to this failure but to the overruling Providence of God, "who taketh the wise in their own craftiness."^{*}

Dangerous as this colloquy was to Luther personally, it was equally so to the Church, which was longing for a reformation. Had he been apprehended and carried to Rome and there executed as he doubtless would have been, the Reformation, in its first outbreak, would have been much retarded. He yet at this time felt the most profound reverence for the pope and the legate, and fell at the feet of the latter the first time he met him. He observed that every possible measure was employed to move him to a recantation. How easily could he as a man and a monk, still full of prejudices for the Romish Church and the pope, have committed an error and with the single word *I recant*, have turned back the work of reform already begun and possibly never again to be resumed.

This colloquy with Cajetan is of special importance in the history of the Reformation.[†]

*See fuller accounts of this and other Conferences in books on the Reformation. D'Aubigne gives the most dramatic account. For some facts not so well known, see my "Journeys of Luther."

†Fabricii Centifol, p. I, cap. XXVIII., p. 56, p. XI, p. 535.

CONFERENCES WITH MILTITZ AND OTHERS.

After this momentous colloquy at Augsburg, Luther held many others, such as that with the papal nuncio, Charles von Miltitz at Altenberg, with the elector of Treves at the Diet of Worms, with Carlstadt at Jena and Orlamunde, with Bucer, Capito and Lycosthene at Wittenberg, and with Zwingli at Marburg. Those with Miltitz and Zwingli are the most important and they only shall be specially noticed. After the signal failure of Cajetan to force a recantation from Luther, Miltitz, of a more mild and conciliatory nature, was despatched to Saxony to employ different measures in subduing the refractory monk. He arrived at Altenberg, and on January 5th, 1519, the colloquy began in Spalatin's house in the presence of the electoral Councillor, Fabian von Feilitzsch.

When Luther entered the room, Miltitz fell upon his neck, kissed him and exclaimed, "O, dear Martin, I thought you were an old, worn out theologian, who sat by your stove and disputed with yourself; but I see that you are a fresh, young, vigorous man.* If I had an army of 25,000 men, still I would doubt whether I could take you out of Germany. For on my journey here, I inquired all along how the people were disposed towards you, and I observed that where one was on the pope's side, there were three on yours against the pope."

He confessed that in a hundred years nothing had occurred that gave the Roman court more concern, and that it would rather lay down ten thousand ducats than to allow this matter to proceed any further."

Luther afterwards said that "although we mutually enjoyed ourselves in this first interview, yet I so demeaned myself as if I were utterly unconscious of his Italian finesse and dissimulation." Luther quickly discerned the wolf in sheep's clothing. Yet it must be acknowledged that Miltitz's manner and treatment of him had a mollifying influence upon him, for he wrote "That he would keep silence in future and write and confess to the pope that he had been too severe, also that he would publicly declare that his theses should not be regarded as contra-

*Luther was at this time 36 years of age.

dictions against the Romish Church, and that the affair should be handed over to a German bishop for decision and settlement."

He soon after wrote another letter to the Elector, in which he briefly informs him of the articles upon which he agreed with Miltitz.

He fulfilled his promise to write to the pope, and in his letter he expresses profound reverence for His Holiness and the Roman court, and declares that he never thought of "separating or tearing himself loose from it." But recantation against his conscience, he could not for a moment entertain. "I freely confess," said he, "that this Church has power over all, and that nothing in heaven or on earth is superior to her, *except Jesus Christ, the Lord over all!*" And upon this foundation, which human authority and human ordinances sought to undermine, must gradually, even though Luther did not wish or originally design it, be built a new edifice, in which God's word must be the highest authority and Christ the true Shepherd.

After Luther had returned to Wittenberg, Miltitz had repaired to Treves, where he politely invited Luther to visit him. He replied with sarcastic decorum, "I have no time to spend in such a distant excursion." He made a new attempt to cite Luther to Coblenz, but Frederick the Wise interposed his authority to prevent it.

The Elector desired that the affair should be settled at Frankfort. Miltitz also soon changed his mind and said that it was not necessary that Luther, for the present, should present himself at Coblenz.

No sooner was this storm abated than there appeared on the horizon the gathering of a still greater. Eck had challenged Luther to meet him at Leipzig in a public discussion, which was held the following year (1519), but as the purpose is to adhere to the plan laid down in the beginning of this article, the *private* conferences will be disposed of first.

CONFERENCE WITH ZWINGLI AT MARBURG.

We now advance ten years farther on (1529), and the cele-

brated conference between our reformer and Zwingli at Marburg arrests our attention.

Of the numerous narratives of this eventful affair, that of Koehler in his "Journeys of Luther," now in press in this country, suits our purpose best, and particular use will be made of it.

The Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, the Magnanimous, was very anxious to strengthen the associates of the alliance established for the defence of the evangelical states, by the accession of those who adhered to the doctrine of Zwingli, and to bring about this event he endeavored to reconcile Luther and Zwingli, who differed from each other on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Hence he invited Luther to a colloquy with Ecolampadius and Zwingli at Marburg.*

Luther wrote to the Landgrave on June 23, in which he expresses his opinion that this conference would result in nothing important. "I have," says he, "received your Grace's letter, in which you inform me of your earnest desire that I should repair to Marburg to have an interview with Ecolampadius and his associates on the subject of the differences of opinion upon the Sacrament, if perchance God might bring about peace and unity: although I never entertained any strong hope of such peace, yet your Grace's zeal and anxiety in this matter are greatly to be praised, and I, for my part, am willing for the sake of your Grace, to engage in this hopeless service, which after all may be accomplished, for I am not willing that the opposite party shall have the credit of being more inclined to peace than I am."

"It appears to me, however, that they, taking advantage of your Grace's zeal, are trying to play a trick upon us, from which no good will result, and that is, that they may hereafter boast to our discredit that it was not their fault, for they had even influenced great princes in its behalf, and thus through your Grace they would bring dishonor upon us and greatly magnify

*The Landgrave wrote to Luther and Melanchthon informing them that the men of the opposite party would also come to the colloquy, wherefore they should punctually appear and devise measures for peace and unity. De Wette, III., 473.

themselves by representing us as enemies of peace and truth." At this time, Luther had adopted such a firm and assured view of the Lord's Supper founded upon the Scriptures, holding it to be the only correct one, that he well knew he could not yield in this point, without proving unfaithful to convictions derived from the Scriptures, and hence he says at the end of the letter: "For it is certain if they do not yield, we will separate without any good result and shall have come together in vain, and your Grace's trouble and zeal will have been for nothing."

We find a similar opinion in a letter in De Wette of June, without specifying the date, which also coincides with one he wrote on Aug. 2 to John Brisman.*

Neither did Melanchthon cherish any bright hope of a favorable result, and hence in a letter to the electoral prince, John Frederick, he advised him to influence the Elector, his father, to refuse his permission for this journey to Marburg.† But his effort was fruitless; the meeting was fixed for Sept. 29, the festival of St. Michael.

About Sept. 23, Luther accompanied by Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, and Caspar Cruciger, left Wittenberg and proceeded on their journey through Erfurt, Gotha and Eisenach. On Thursday, Sept. 30, they arrived at Marburg, and were graciously received by the Landgrave. They were quartered, not in the city, as was first determined, but in the castle, although soon after they moved to a special residence.‡

* De Wette, III., 491: *Vocavit nos Landgravius Hassiae ad Diem Michaelis Marburgum, tentaturus concordiam inter nos et sacramentarios: Philippus et ego cum diu recusassemus et frustra reluctati essemus, tandem coacti sumus improbitate ejus promittere, nos venturos, nec dam Scio, au prefectus procedet.*

De Wette expresses it very mildly when he says, that Luther complains of the *turbulent* spirit of the Landgrave, for the word "*improbitas*" clearly means something more. Luther most probably means by this word that the Landgrave was less concerned about the *doctrine* in this meeting than the political *alliance* at which he aimed, which was very likely.

† Hall, Annal. Thl., XVII., 2356.

‡ A House near The Bears' Fountain is to this day pointed out as Luther's residence.

Besides those already mentioned and M. George Noverius from Wittenberg, there were present at the colloquy on the Lutheran side, Andrew Osiander, John Brentius from Halle in Swabia, and Stephen Agricola, preacher at Augsburg.

On the part of the Swiss, there appeared John *Œcolampadius*, Dr. of Theology at Basel, Ulrich Zwingli, preacher at Zurich, Martin Bucer, preacher at Strasburg, and Caspar Hedio, of the same place.

By the direction of the Landgrave, besides several of his councillors, there were present the Hessian court preacher, M. Adam Fulda, the Superintendent Crato (*Kraft*), and the Professor of Theology, Dr. Franciscus Lambertus, John Schnepf, John Lonicerus, Dr. Stephen Frosch, and Melander, preacher at Cassel. Of the civil dignitaries who were in Marburg at that time, the following especially deserve mention: Eberhard von der Thann, bailiff at the Wartburg, Jacob Sturm, a prominent member of the council at Strasburg, Ulrich Funke, councillor at Zurich, and Rudolf Frey, councillor at Basel.

The Landgrave adopted the prudent measure that on Oct. 1 Luther should have a private interview with *Œcolampadius*, and Melanchthon with Zwingli, thus opposing one of ardent temperament with one of moderate disposition, who would not, on account of previous controversies, enter upon the discussion with resentment against each other. To the objection against the doctrine of Zwingli, the latter replied so satisfactorily, as Melanchthon reports, that he in part recanted what he had formerly written upon the subject.

On Oct. 2, the discussion took place, at which were present the Landgrave, his principal councillors and the persons mentioned above. In the course of the debate on the Lord's Supper, it was soon made evident that there was no prospect of yielding on either side, as the three grounds, which the Swiss theologians adduced as their defence, as well as the refutation of them by Luther, had been so frequently brought forward in the writings of both parties and answered.

On Oct. 3, the debate was renewed in a hall next to the Landgrave's chamber and was continued to the evening, after Luther had preached on this day on "Spiritual Righteousness or the

Forgiveness of Sins."* These two debates by no means decided the controversy. Hence the Landgrave felt himself compelled on Oct. 4 to make another attempt to reconcile the contending parties. The result was that Luther and Melanchthon held a special interview with Zwingli and Oecolampadius, whilst Brenz treated with Bucer and Hedio. This attempt also failed to accomplish the purpose. Luther then felt compelled to prepare fourteen, some say fifteen, articles upon which they agreed and which both parties signed. In the last, the papal doctrine of the Holy Supper was denounced, by which it was declared, that, although they could not agree on this point, yet that each party should, as far as their conscience allowed, exhibit Christian love to the other.

Of this date, we have a letter of Luther to his wife, in which among other things he says, "This is to let you know that our friendly talk in Marburg has come to an end and we are one on nearly all points, except that the other side maintains that it is mere bread in the *Sacrament*, and that Christ is therein only spiritually present. To-day, the Landgrave is trying to reconcile us in our views, or if we cannot agree, that at least, we should regard each other as brethren and members of Christ. He showed ardent zeal in his endeavor. But of this 'brethren' and 'members' we will not hear, though we are still desirous of entertaining the kindest feelings towards them."†

He writes the same subsequently to John Agricola, in which he especially declares, that he still holds fast to the words, "This is my body." Towards the end, he also says, "At last they besought us that we would at least recognize them as brethren, and upon which the Landgrave insisted strongly, but that could not be granted to them; we however, extended the hand of peace and affection and that in the mean time all unduly severe

*The tradition is still extant, that Luther on his way to the castle, exclaimed at every step, *Hoc est! hoc est!* (This is! this is!) as an admonition to himself not to depart from his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

†To Gerbellius in *De Wet.* III. 3, he writes: "Charitatem et pacem etiam hostibus debemus. Sane denuntiatum est eis, nisi et hoc articulo resipiscant, charitatate quidem nostra posse eos uti, sed in fratum et Christi membrorum numero a nobis censori non posse."

language in writing or speech be avoided, and that each party should teach its opinions without unbecoming coarseness, but not without argument and opposition."

During his sojourn at Marburg, he also sent a communication to the Landgrave in which he vindicates the doctrine of the bodily presence of Christ in the Sacrament by quotations from the Church Fathers.

When Hempel in his History of the Christian Religion, Leipzig, 1830, vol. I., 355, blames Luther for betraying on this occasion a severe and unjustifiable zeal in maintaining a favorite doctrine or a dishonorable triumph, he certainly goes too far and forgets to place himself upon Luther's standpoint, by whom the word of God was estimated above all other things and from which he could not deviate even at the sacrifice of peace with all men. But we believe that those also in our times, on the other hand, go too far and aid in disturbing the peace of the Christian Church, who like Luther are continually exclaiming "This is" and do not recognize that the words also conceal within them "It represents" as the Scriptures plainly prove, and as Luther himself in his Catechism shows. Leopold Ranke beautifully and truly says, "How much misapprehension about the articles of faith, how many controversies would vanish, how much *true union* would ensue, if men would determine to read Luther's writings with hearts desirous of securing salvation."

If we plant ourselves with Luther on the Scriptures, if we teach with him out of and according to the Scriptures, while so many elevate themselves above the Bible and make out of it what they desire, then shall we more and more show ourselves to be members of one Body and find in the *repentance* which the Holy Supper requires and the *grace* which it offers, a basis of union, which would elevate us above all mere verbal controversy and would not suffer us to substitute the letter for the spirit. But as we are not what we should be, let us follow after that which is yet lacking and patiently bear with each other, giving heed to the admonition of Paul in Phil. 3:12, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect, but I follow after, if that I may apprehend."

Luther has been severely censured for his treatment of

Zwingli at Marburg, and of course his friends have come to the rescue. Dr. Krauth in his paper on "The relations of the Lutheran Church to the Denominations around us," read at the First Diet in Philadelphia, 1877, and published in the volume issued by the Diet, gives a very enlightened statement of the case which is here inserted:

"At Marburg the whole question was epitomized, and Luther there passed through a soror struggle, a mightier temptation, and showed himself more matchless as a hero than at Worms—for what is harder than to reject the advances of seeming love, which pleads for our acknowledgment on the ground of devotion to a common cause. Luther saved the Reformation by withholding the hand, whose grasp would have meant the recognition of fundamental error—either as in unity with faith, or as too little a thing to be weighed. Not only Luther's personal qualities, but his religious and reformatory principles, were precisely the same as revealed against Rome and against the Zwinglian tendencies. There is no consistency in blaming him in his relation to the latter, while we praise him for his attitude to the former. It would have been a surrender of the vital principle by which the Reformation itself stands or falls—the authority and clearness of the Word. Concession at the point at which Zwingli demanded it would not have stopped there. Other concessions to other errors would have been demanded, with equal justice, on the same grounds. The political element was no small one in this early desire for Unionism, and the complexion it would have given would have brought a Capel, at which not Zwingli but the Reformation itself would have fallen. We know well that there are good people so blinded to the real character of the scene at Marburg that they regard Zwingli's course as the very embodiment of Christian love, and Luther, they think of, as hurried away by the zealotry of partisanship. When Zwingli declared that he desired fellowship with no men so much as with the Wittenbergers, he pressed on them the hand of fraternity, he wept because they declined taking it. What a loving, large spirit is that! men exclaim; and how poor before it seems the narrowness of Luther and of Melanchthon, of whom the editor of Zwingli's works has said that 'at that

time he was almost harsher than Luther himself.* But the men of Wittenberg had not forgotten how Zwingli, in 1524, had endorsed the book which Carlstadt had directed against Luther under the title: 'Of the execrable abuse of the Eucharist.' They had not forgotten that, in 1525, Zwingli had assailed Luther in his 'Commentary of true and false Religion,' had pronounced Luther's language on the Eucharist as 'monstrous,' and had said in the most sweeping way that 'neither were those to be listened to who though they saw that the opinion cited' (Luther's) 'was not only coarse, but impious and frivolous, yet said that we eat Christ's true body, but spiritually.' The Wittenbergers had not forgotten that he had called those who held the doctrine of the true presence 'Carnivori,' 'a stupid set of men,' and had said that the doctrine was 'impious, foolish, inhuman and worthy of anthropophagites.' And these were the amenities of Zwingli at a period when Luther had not written a solitary word against him. The Wittenbergers had not forgotten that in that same year the book of Zwingli had been followed up by another, in which he characterizes the holders of Luther's view as "cannibals." They had not forgotten that in 1527 Zwingli had distinctly declared that his own view involved the fundamentals of faith, and had condemned Bucer for saying that 'either view might be held without throwing faith overboard.' On this Zwingli says: 'I do not approve of his view. To believe that consciences are established by eating flesh, is conjoined with throwing faith overboard (*cum fidei jactura*).† The Wittenbergers had not forgotten that in 1527 Zwingli had written a book against Luther, had dedicated it to the Elector of Saxony, and charged Luther to his own Elector with 'error and great audacity,' which he claims to have 'exposed.' All this the Wittenbergers could not forget, but all this they could have forgiven had it been sorrowed over and withdrawn; but all this remained unretracted, unexplained, unregretted. Zwingli himself being judge, there was not the fraternity of a common faith. The conflicting modes of interpretation involved in fact

*H. Zwingli's Werke: (Schuler u. Schulthess) Vol. II. iii. 55.

†Exegesis ad Lutherum.

the whole revelation of God. What Zwingli still held of the old faith would have gone down before his rationalistic method, just as surely as what he already rejected. All went down before it in aftertime. Luther uttered the warning, but Zwingli would not believe it. His course was the beginning of that effusive sentiment of compromise, which from the rill of 1529 has gathered to the torrent of 1877, and before which we are expected to allow, without a struggle, all fixed principle to be swept away.

"How fleeting the better mind of Zwingli was, is shown by the fact that on the margin of a copy of the Articles of Agreement at Marburg, he wrote annotations, which prove how hollow, superficial and untrustworthy the whole thing was on his part.

"The violence of Zwingli had been the more unpardonable because he had originally held the same view of the Lord's Supper as Luther, and must have known that it did not involve what he charges upon it. Even in 1526 he wrote to Billican and others who held Luther's doctrine: 'You affirm that Christ's true body is eaten, but in a certain ineffable manner.' Zwingli, indeed, confesses in so many words that he had rejected the literal and historical interpretation of the words of the Lord's Supper, before he was able to assign even to his own mind a reason for it. He tells us that after he had made up his conviction without a reason, a dream suggested a reason. It was indeed a reason demonstratively irrelevant—an interpretation which his co-workers, Carlstadt and Ecolampadius, both rejected, and at which a fair scholar of any school would now laugh—but it was enough to begin the great schism whose miseries live and spread to this hour. The mode which unsettles the doctrine of the true presence, unsettles every distinctive Evangelical doctrine—the method which explains it away explains everything away. To give it up is in principle to give up everything. The division began at the doctrine of the Eucharist; the union must begin at the point of division. The bone must be knit where it was broken, or the arm of the Church will continue to be distorted and enfeebled.

"In a few months after the scenes at Marburg, without a voca-

tion from God to man, Zwingli prepared a Confession, part of whose object was to condemn the views of our Church, and to mark his own separation from it. He attempted to thrust upon the Diet at Augsburg his rationalistic speculations, whose tendency was to throw contempt upon our Confession, to weaken and endanger our cause, to peril the liberty and lives of our confessors, and to hazard the cause of the entire Reformation. It was an uncalled-for parading of division in the presence of a ruthless enemy. In his Confession, he classes the Lutherans with the Papists, and speaks of them as 'those who are looking back to the flesh-pots of Egypt.' He characterizes our doctrine as an 'error in conflict with God's Word,' and says that 'he will make this as clear as the sun to the emperor, and will attack the opponents with arguments like battering-rams.' This is dated July 3d, 1530. Contrast it with the brief and gentle words, which on June 25th, had been presented in the Tenth Article of the Augsburg Confession: 'Therefore, the opposite doctrine is rejected,' 'and they disapprove of those who teach in a contrary way.'

MISCELLANEOUS CONFERENCES.

Besides these colloquies with *theologians*, Luther held many with electors, princes and other high civilians, in which the most momentous questions of religion were discussed. Fabri-
cius gives an account of them in his *Centifolium Lutheranum*, Part II., p. 608, and even he with all his usual fulness has over-
looked a few and especially that held in Merseburg in 1545.

It was on this occasion that Luther ordained to the office of the ministry Prince George of Anhalt, who particularly requested this service from Luther because he "had no confidence in the bishops of that ecclesiastical district and who would not have performed the sacred rite of ordination without the practice of the abuses common on such occasions." The prince evidently by "the abuses" meant, the unscriptural ceremonies of the Romish church. The solemn act was witnessed by many persons of high civil and ecclesiastical rank.

In this his last Conference, he showed an almost incredible diligence. It was just fifteen months before his death, when as

he himself says, "Aged, worn out, weary, spiritless and now blind of one eye, I long for a little rest and quietness, yet I have as much to do in writing, and preaching and acting, as if I had never written, preached or acted. I am weary of the world and the world is weary of me; the parting will be easy, like that of the guest leaving the inn; I pray only that God will be gracious to me in my last hour and I shall quit the world without reluctance."

Having given brief descriptions of his more *private Conferences and Colloquies*, let us proceed to view what have been designated as his *public Disputations*.

LUTHER'S FIRST DISPUTATION.

The first disputation of Luther which we yet have in print is the question, "An homo ad Dei imaginem creatus, naturalibus suis viribus Dei Gloriosi creatoris precepta servare, *bonum quipiam* facere aut cogitare, atque *ad gratiam* mereri, meritaque cognoscere possit?" This was held at Wittenberg in 1516, a year before the public annunciation of the famous 95 propositions. Some notice of this discussion and of Luther's notes and comments may be seen in Loescher's *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, Tom. I., c. xv., p. 328. It is worthy of attention from the fact that it clearly shows that as early as 1516 Luther was led by the Holy Spirit, to contest and refute the errors of Rome. Loescher and others hold that these theses should be regarded as the beginning of the Reformation, at any rate he here significantly foreshadowed the fundamental doctrine of the Reformation in smiting the very heart of popery, namely the doctrine of the merit of good works, of preparation for conversion and justification by selfrighteous deeds, and of confidence in good works and in the saints.

It also affords demonstrative proof, that Luther not only preached but publicly disputed against popery several years before Zwingle, and that hence the honor of being the first reformer belongs to him.

DISPUTATION ON THE NINETY-FIVE THESES.

More important than the former and in regard to momentous

results probably the most important of all, was the one upon which he entered by himself on Oct. 31, 1517. He challenged the whole Romish Church by the publication of his 95 propositions. This story so often narrated and so familiar to all intelligent persons will never lose its interest. The sounds of the hammer by which he attached the almost divinely inspired document to the castle gate, have not ceased their reverberations to this day. The echo was first heard against the walls, the gates, the pillars of popery and shook them to their foundations. It penetrated the palace, the cloister, the church, the university. The heroes of popery were struck with amazement at the extraordinary sound, which at the same time awakened thousands from the sleep of error and sin. True, many and mighty opponents rose up and endeavored to annihilate the theses, but they accomplished nothing. It has been observed by wise men that no special enterprise ever undertaken by man for the glory of God and the defense of the truth, seemed to enjoy such a singular divine protection. Every biography of Luther and every history of the Reformation must necessarily expatiate upon this grand event, and the further exhibition of it here would be superfluous.

DISPUTATION WITH ECK AT LEIPZIG.

The public controversy with Eck at Leipzig in 1519 was distinguished by many peculiarities, and has in every generation since it occurred, been regarded by all historians as unspeakably important.

In the presentation of this interesting event, special use will be made of a translation of Köhler's "Luther's Reisen."

Dr. John Eck was a conspicuous actor in the scenes about to be described. His real name was *Mayer*, and he was born in 1486, in the Suabian village *Eck*, and according to the custom of the times, assumed the name *von Eck*; but to distinguish him from *John von Eck*, a jurist and an official of the Elector of Treves,* he was called simply *Eck*. He was a learned man,

*It was the jurist John von Eck and not the theological opponent of Luther who put the questions to him at the Diet of Worms concerning his books.

and taught theology at the University of Ingolstadt for many years with success.

Luther awarded justice to his vast theological attainments, although he jocosely said of him, "that he skipped over God's Word like a water-spider over the surface of the stream."

A year before (1518) at Augsburg, Dr. Eck and Luther had agreed to hold a disputation at Leipzig. Eck, who was pro-chancellor of the city of Ingolstadt, and inquisitor in Bavaria and Franconia, had previously carried on a controversy with Andrew Bodenstein, of Carlstadt, in Franconia, canon and arch-deacon in Wittenberg and with other theologians. Luther met Eck in Augsburg, and asked him whether he would not meet Bodenstein, also known as Carlstadt, in a discussion at Leipzig, for the final settlement of the question at issue between them. Dr. Eck, however, thought it too small a matter to carry away the honors of a triumph over the comparatively undistinguished Carlstadt; he expressed a wish also to measure his strength upon the yet unconquered Luther.* Previous to this, Eck had published a book, which he called *Obelisks*, that is, "Spears," in which he attacked Luther's Theses on Indulgences in a malignant and virulent manner. But in his announcement of the doctrinal points which were to be discussed at Leipzig, in which he attacked the University of Wittenberg, Luther felt himself challenged again to take up the controversy which had been nearly settled, although he felt disposed, as he was now forcibly drawn out, the sooner the better to retire into obscurity, so far as it would be without prejudice to his honor as a Christian. Luther accepted the challenge, and immediately prepared some theses antagonistical to those of Eck, in which, with the most vigorous and overwhelming arguments, he assailed the sovereignty of the pope, which his opponents had exalted beyond all precedent. Although the Leipzig theologians, as well as the bishop of Merseburg, Adolphus, prince of Anhalt, to whose diocese the city belonged, did all in their power to prevent the discussion, yet the lord of the province, Duke George, by emphatic and personal interference, and by ordering the advertised

*Sleidanus, l. i., p. 22, "Joannes Eckius, theologus animosus et audax."

prohibition to be torn down from the church doors, succeeded in bringing the disputation to pass.

Dr. Eck, on February 19, challenged Luther to the disputation in these words: "I have appointed June 22d as the day on which we will commence the discussion. As Carlstadt is your champion, but you are the principal—for this reason it seems good to me that you yourself should appear at the place." He expected to distinguish himself particularly, because he was already quite celebrated for the discussions he had held in Bologna and Vienna in 1515 and 1516.

But Luther felt himself a match for his opponent, and in a written petition to Duke George, he begged permission to engage in the disputation, which was however denied him, as appears from a letter to Spalatin, dated February 16, in which he says: "Duke George answered me twice and will not allow me to dispute, although I told him that Eck forces me both in letters and public advertisements to reply to him. I will now write to him the third time."

Notwithstanding this, a "safe conduct" was denied to Luther, so that according to his own showing, he came to Leipzig not as a *disputant* but as a *hearer*. Yet Eck prevailed upon the Duke to permit Luther to enter the arena. Perhaps the Duke wished to enjoy the triumph of witnessing his discomfiture, in which however he was deceived, although many of Luther's opponents claimed the victory for themselves. "For it mortified the Duke," says Myconius, "that the University of Wittenberg should gain such reputation, and that of Leipzig be depreciated."

Eck had arrived at Leipzig earlier, even before the festival of Corpus Christi, and appeared in the procession together with the Leipzig theologians. This festival was celebrated on that day with great pomp. He was habited in sacerdotal vestments and made a grand display, so that he might demonstrate his assurance of victory over the Wittenbergers in advance.*

*In what follows, we make particular use of the narrative of Sebastian Fröschel, at that time Magister in Leipzig, afterwards Deacon in Wittenberg, who witnessed the entrance of the Wittenberg theologians and was

On Friday before Corpus Christi (June 24) Luther also arrived in Leipzig, accompanied by Duke Barnim, of Pomerania.* Carlstadt and Philip Melanchthon. They drove in open vehicles through the Grimma gate, Carlstadt in advance, followed by Luther and Melanchthon. The Wittenberg students who had traveled with their teachers to Leipzig, walked by the side of the carriages, and were armed with spears and halberds. When they reached the door which leads into St. Paul's church-yard, Carlstadt's carriage broke down and he was pitched into the mud. Luther and Melanchthon drove past him. The people who saw this, said :

"This one (Luther) will conquer, the other (Carlstadt) will be overcome, as it has already happened" (Fröschel). On the Saturday after Corpus Christi, Dr. Emser also arrived.

Even before the public discussion began, the Wittenberg and Leipzig students had such violent conflicts in the taverns, that the landlords were compelled to station armed men at their tables to maintain peace. A certain M. Baumgärtner, who had traveled around with Tetzel and supported him in his trade of indulgences, became so terribly incensed against a Wittenberg student of noble rank on account of Luther, that it cost him his life. Fröschel assisted in carrying him to the grave.

On Sunday after Trinity, June 26, all those who were to take part in the discussion assembled at the castle (Pleissenburg) where also the ducal commissioners, Cæsar Pflug, Chancellor, Dr. John Küchel, Private Secretary, and George von Niedebach, Castellan at Leipzig, had previously repaired. In this meeting the conditions were established :

1. Carlstadt was to speak first and then Luther.

present at the disputation. See his book "Vom Kœnigreich Christi u. Seinem eigenen Priesterthume," Wittenberg, 1566.

Compare Kœhler's treatise on Sebastian Fröschel in the *Zeitschrift für histor. Theologie* von Dr. K. F. A. Kahnis, 1872, 4tes Heft, p. 512.

Unschuld, Nachr., 1717, p. 12. M. Jacobi Thomasii *Orationes*. Lips., 1683, "De Disputatione Lipsiensi."

De Wette. Bd. 1, vom 20 juli. 18 aug ad Spalatin, p. 284, u. 306.

Lingke, a. a. o. p. 61.

*At that time student in Wittenberg and rector of the University.

2. That a correct report was to be made, and hence that they were to speak slowly; and
3. That the transactions should not be printed until a decision should be pronounced upon them.

Eck proposed the pope and several universities, but Luther unconditionally rejected the first and only consented to the latter after long resistance, and preferred an appeal to a general free Church Congress.*

Luther, who was fully aware of the dishonest designs of his opponents, thus expressed himself upon the approaching discussion, "The affair was not begun in God's name, and it will not end in God's name." On Monday, June 27, at 7 o'clock in the morning, the parties with their friends from Wittenberg and Ingolstadt met in the "Large College." As hearers, there were present the Duke himself with his Councillors, the Magistrates, the Doctors and Bachelors of the University, and an immense crowd of people from all the neighboring towns.

The meeting was opened by Dr. Simon Pistoris, Ordinary of the Faculty of Law, with a "magnificent" Latin oration in the name of the University. After the conclusion of the speech, they proceeded by twos, a Leipziger and a Wittenberger together, to St. Thomas' church, where chorister Rhaw,† with the assistance of the bookbinder Herbipolis, and other vocalists, sang a mass of twelve voices.

From the church they proceeded to the castle, where the Duke was not present,‡ but the most distinguished members of the court, also young Barnim, of Pomerania, as well as many counts, abbots, knights, and people of all ranks, had previously assembled. There were also four citizens appointed, clothed in coats of mail, with their banners and weapons, to maintain peace and order as long as the discussion lasted—that is, every morning from 7 to 9, and in the afternoon from 2 to 5 (Fröschel).

*M. Vogel's Leipzig, *Annalen*, p. 97 seq., Seckendorff a. a. o. l., 1, and 54 seq., p. 72 seq.

Loescher's *Acta Reform.* Thl. iii. Kap. 8, u. g., p. 214.

†Rhaw later was a printer in Wittenberg, where he published many of Luther's works.

‡ Others say he was present.

The main business, however, was not yet begun; but there was first a Latin address made by the learned Peter Mosellanus (*Peter Schade*), from Brüttig on the Mosel, professor of the Greek language in Leipzig, in which he spoke of the true method of disputing theological subjects, and exhorted the disputants to moderation, love of the truth, reverence for the Holy Scriptures, and to the confession of their convictions.* At the conclusion of the discourse, chorister Rhaw and other musicians led in the singing of the hymn, "Veni Sancte Spiritus" (Come, Holy Spirit), whilst all present reverently kneeled.

As the discourse was full two hours long, so that the time of dinner had come, the session was terminated, and was opened again in the afternoon at 2 o'clock, with the same hymn, upon which the discussion began.

First, Dr. Carlstadt and Dr. Eck entered the lists, and commenced their disputation upon "Free Will," which was continued four days upon the same subject. After this, Luther disputed with Eck nine days upon Purgatory, Indulgences, Absolution, Repentance, and the Papal Primacy. The last subject was discussed most violently, as Luther maintained that the Primacy could not be proved from the Scriptures, but was based on human rights and presumption, which must also now be admitted fully and truthfully.

Luther expressed himself upon this subject so contrary to the general belief, that many present, and with them Duke George, were absolutely alarmed.

As Luther during the disputation said to Eck, that not all the articles of Huss were heretical, the displeasure of the Duke was demonstrated by shaking his head. (Fröschel).

After Luther had valiantly contended for nine days, Carlstadt renewed the disputation for two days; but there was no obvious result.

Luther retired from the contest sooner than Carlstadt, who still continued it with Eck. A considerable number of learned men surrounded him. But in proportion as he was honored by these proofs of profound veneration by his friends, the wrath of

*Peter Mosellani *Oratio de ratione disputandi praesertim in re theologica.*

his enemies was excited. Carlstadt finished the learned contest with Eck, which exceedingly inflamed the minds of many, but which, upon the whole, resulted in nothing definite.

Both parties claimed the victory.

The following deserves to be recorded concerning Luther's sojourn in Leipzig :

He was invited by Duke Barnim, with the sanction of Duke George, whose kindness and munificence he speaks highly of in a letter to Spalatin* on August 15, 1519, to preach on the 29th of June in the castle church, to which he consented. His text was Matt. 16: 13-20.† As soon as this was known in the town, the crowd became so great that he was compelled to preach this sermon in the spacious hall in which the discussion was held. The subject was "Free Will, and the power of St. Peter and of the Keys." Pflug, who was absent at the time, declared upon his return, "I wish Dr. Martin had spared his sermon for Wittenberg." Luther was urged by many other parties to preach again, but it was not allowed him, while Eck afterwards preached four times against him in different churches.

Mosellanus, who wrote an account of the discussion, gives us a true picture of Luther when he says :‡ "Martin is of medium height, and so emaciated by anxiety and hard study, that you can nearly count his bones through his body, and yet vigorous and sprightly, and of a clear and elevated voice. He is so thoroughly learned, and has such a familiarity with the Scriptures, that he can count every thing on his fingers. In his deportment he is courteous and social, and has nothing morose and severe about him. In company he is cheerful, genial, always in good humor, and hopeful, so that it is hard to believe that this man can undertake these weighty enterprises without the divine help and sanction."

Mosellanus could not have set him forth in stronger light, as

*De Wette. Bd. 1. S. 299.

†Hoffman's *Histoire von Leipzig*. S. 123-130. The sermon was printed the same year, at Leipzig, by Wolfgang, Stockel.

‡In a beautiful Latin letter to Bilibad Birkheimer, of Nurnberg. Comp. Chr. Fred. Junii *compendium Seckendorfianum* 1755. Book 1. p. 135, and Seckendorff Com. *Hist. de Lutheranismo.* T. N. p. 141.

he appeared at that time. In after years, his physical condition was changed, but his spirit always continued vigorous; and even in the severest sufferings his cheerful disposition never forsook him. He did not allow himself to despond even in Leipzig, although he was not altogether satisfied with his reception, as plainly appears from his own letters.*

"They," (the Leipzigers) he says, "neither salute us nor visit us, and treat us as their greatest enemies. They associated with him (Eck), clung to him, entertained him hospitably, invited him to their houses, took him out on pleasure excursions, presented him with a tunic, etc., and in a word, they tried to mortify us in every possible way. They did one thing, and that was, they made a present to us of some wine. Those who were on our side visited us secretly. Dr. Auerbach once invited us to his house—he was a man of very sound judgment; Pistor Jr., did the same; the Duke also invited us there at the same time."

In his report to the Elector, he employs the following remarkable words: "Some began to imagine that I carry a familiar spirit with me."

That such a report prevailed in Leipzig also appears from a letter which Eck wrote to the Elector of Saxony, in which he says: "Whether Dr. Luther carries a familiar spirit with him, I know nothing about it, and no one in Leipzig has ever heard me ascribe anything of the kind to him; but this is true, that with a little string and small ring attached to one finger, he bore something, and this occasioned much talk among the people." Probably Luther's skill in disputation, in which he "could count everything on his fingers," gave rise to this tale.

Even the monks at Leipzig, to whom this fable was probably not unknown, feared Luther's alleged spirit of divination.

Fröschel relates the following fact in relation to it:

"During the celebration of Corpus Christi, Luther went into St. Paul's Church, as the monks had the monstranz upon the altar of St. Dominic in the morning. As soon as they observed

*De Wette. Bd. I. S. 284. Letter to Spalatin of July 20, 1519, and to the same of Aug. 15. 290.

that Dr. Luther was in the church, they snatched the monstranz and other sacred vessels from the altars, and hurried with the greatest speed into the sacristy, where they locked it up, afraid that Luther would poison the holy sacrament, and the other monks who were reading mass at other altars hastily gathered their holy implements and rushed out as though Satan himself were after them."*

For the discouraging experience which Luther had at Leipzig, he was compensated by some friends and supporters whom he found there. Among these was Pistor the younger, mentioned above, who is to be distinguished from the senior, who was Doctor of Medicine and Ordinary of the Faculty of Law. It was the latter who opened the discussion, or rather the introduction to it, with a Latin discourse.

An especially dear friend of Luther was Henry Stromeyer of Auerbach, who had previously made his acquaintance in Augsburg. He was Professor of Therapeutics, Dean of the Medical Faculty, Councillor, and owner of the house which was afterwards called "Auerbach's Court."

Besides these, Dr. Breitenbach and Henry von Schleinitz were friendly to him. The latter was a ducal councillor. They invited Luther as a guest, and they gave other evidences of their friendly feelings. There were others upon whom he made favorable impressions, so that they soon held public discourses in his spirited style. Fröschel mentions Andrew Comitianus, M. Reusch, M. Hegendorff and Mosellanus, the last of whom delivered lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. But among those who soon professed the evangelical faith, must be especially mentioned John Cellarius, Professor of Hebrew at Leipzig, who resigned his professorship, repaired to Wittenberg, and continued his studies under the direction of Luther, until he became a preacher in Frankfort-on-the-Main, in 1522, and subsequently superintendent at Dresden. George Rhaw, the chorister in St. Thomas' church mentioned above, resigned his office, went to Wittenberg, and there established a printing office, at which many of Luther's works were printed. John

*De Wette, Bd. I., 284 and 290.

Poliander also, who came to Leipzig with Eck, and had reported the disputation on Eck's side, embraced the evangelical doctrine, which was also the case with Sebastian Fröschel, magister and private teacher at Leipzig.

Many Leipzig students also went to Wittenberg, and many inhabitants of the same city abandoned the Romish faith, and connected with some evangelical churches in the neighboring villages. On the other hand, Duke George, who previously had not been disinclined towards Luther, now became a sworn enemy of the Reformation. For when his courtiers observed that the truth was beginning to shine into his mind, they tried in connection with the Catholic priesthood to prevent this result, and to defame Luther, in which they unfortunately succeeded.

The Catholic party has often reproached Luther for leaving Leipzig sooner than Carlstadt; but he had good reasons for this course; for the discussion had properly been finished, as the reports distinctly show, in which it is said, "On the 14th of July, at 7 in the morning, Eck continued" (wider abreden). It must also not be forgotten that the discussion was really ended, and that Luther only appeared as second contestant. He had also been convinced that notwithstanding his superiority nothing would result from the whole affair; hence he, tired of the discussion, would no longer have anything to do with Eck, and thought it most advisable to leave Leipzig. This also appears from the words which he wrote in relation to Eck. He says: "I have already yesterday replied to the nonsense of the Doctor; for, like a ridiculous player on the harp, he always comes back to the same old hum-drum; he has not touched the point in dispute. Thirdly, to-day he entirely ignored the Holy Scriptures." More Luther could not say in justification of his departure and his silence, inasmuch as further discussion under such circumstances could produce no good results. To all this must be added, that he had learned that Dr. Staupitz was in Grimma, as his letter to Spalatin of July 29 shows, and it must not be overlooked that Eck himself does not speak complainingly of the accusations made to the Electors concerning Luther's early departure, but thinks the reason was that Luther,

together with Carlstadt, had requested the Duke to break up the discussion, because the University would suffer from their long absence, and that the strangers present would be put to too great expense by its longer continuance.*

There is another reason given by Mosellanus which should not be overlooked, and that is, that the expected arrival of the Elector of Brandenburg would necessitate the evacuation of the chamber at the castle (Pleissenberg); and yet it is very probable that this was merely a subterfuge to get rid of a subject from which they apprehended no happy results. Although Luther was not present at the valedictory sermon preached by John Lange, yet all due praise was awarded him for his learning, discrimination, boldness and firmness.

According to the letter of July 20, he left Leipzig not directly for Wittenberg, but for Grimma, where he wished to consult Staupitz. He arrived in Wittenberg on July 19, where he was honored with a present of money by the Council, as appears from their proceedings of 1519. His departure from Leipzig was probably on July 14. On the day following his arrival (July 20), he gave Spalatin a full report of the contest, and among other things said, that although Eck exceeded Carlstadt in noise and vehement gestures, yet that he (Carlstadt) had admirably maintained all his positions, and had thoroughly refuted the arguments of his opponent, and that finally the cunning and unscrupulous Eck had yielded to all that Carlstadt claimed, against which he had before fought valiantly, and agreed with him in all points, although he falsely boasted that he had won Carlstadt to his opinions. Subsequently he practiced a similar trick, as church history abundantly shows.

PECULIARITIES OF THE LEIPZIG CONTROVERSY.

It was observed above that this disputation was distinguished by some peculiarities, some of which shall here be specified.

The first was the formidable opposition made by friends of both parties to its being held. Not only did influential papists oppose it violently but many friends of Luther vehemently ad-

* Hall A. Th., xv., R. 1571.

vised him against disputing with Eck on *the primacy of the pope*. Even the pope himself resisted it and ordered the bishop Merseburg, as chancellor of the University and the theological faculty, not to suffer it. The prohibition was accordingly nailed on the church door. Duke George favored a general discussion, but finally opposed any controversy on the *pope's primacy* and he would not grant Luther "a safe conduct" though the latter requested it three times. The University even tried to excite the common people against it, so that the civil authorities might be led to prohibit it for fear of an insurrection.

Notwithstanding all the obstructions laid in the way by the papists, the discussion took place and the subject most dreaded by them, the papal supremacy, was not omitted. The whole history of this proceeding is intensely interesting but there is no room here for the narrative.* But divine Providence controlled this affair, for in the discussion Luther became more deeply grounded than ever in the conviction that the pope's assumption of control over all christendom was utterly untenable and demonstrated it clearly before the vast audience and the complete overthrow of this assumption gave a powerful impulse to the Reformation. This was Providence.

Eck himself may have entertained some fears of the result of the controversy, although he appeared anxious to encounter Luther, and hence he added to his twelve *Positions*, which were to be discussed, a thirteenth, on the dreaded subject, the pope's primacy, thereby laying a trap for Luther. He vainly presumed that Luther would not dare to deny that fundamental doctrine of papacy and would decline the discussion, so that he might boast that his opponent refused to meet him and thus be exposed to derision and scoffing. But if Luther would still agree to the contest, he would either have to acknowledge the superiority of the pope and concede the whole point, and thus give Eck the victory, or that Luther would deny the doctrine, which would bring down upon him the hatred and opposition of all classes and even put his life in peril. So formidable to the papists even at this early period was the heroic Luther.

*See Læscher Reform. Act. Tom. III. cap. VIII. S. 214-507.

But, secondly, Luther was not to be caught in the snare so cunningly laid, and although he well knew that by contesting the pope's superiority he would more expose himself to the scaffold, which he had already done by his opposition to Indulgences, he did not for a moment flinch from his purpose of maintaining the whole truth. He displayed on this occasion the same unshaken firmness, the same heroic zeal and the same buoyant cheerfulness that always distinguished him in times of trial and danger. He was always ready for a martyr's death, rather than compromise the truth in the least degree.

He went to Leipzig without any security for his personal safety; and this was a bold venture, but a wonderful Providence guided and protected him. His conduct during the debate excited the admiration of all for his manliness and unterrified bravery.

Extraordinary solemnities were associated with the opening and closing of this discussion. On the first day, which was June 27, the disputants and a large number of doctors, professors, masters, students and others from various parts all around, assembled in the "College," where they were greeted in a Latin oration by D. Simon Pistoris, the Dean of the Faculty of Law. Thence they proceeded, as has been mentioned before, to the church of St. Thomas. Here there was grand music and another Latin oration by Mosellanus. In the afternoon they assembled again and every day a large number of the citizens in coats of mail and spears, guarded the passages against the entrance of the surging crowd of common people. The conclusion was celebrated with a Latin oration of the Rector Magnificus, John Langius, and sacred music, accompanied by trumpets and horns.

The presiding officer of this disputation also rendered it remarkable. It was Duke George, who was sovereign of that district, and who at that time was one of the most powerful princes in the Roman empire, and in high favor at Rome. It must be mentioned, however, that he presided only during the contest between Eck and Luther, and not when Eck and Carlstadt were engaged in the debate.

The large and influential assembly, before which the dispute

was held, was extraordinary. Besides Duke George there were present Duke John, the hereditary successor of Duke George, Duke Barnim, Prince George of Anhalt, numerous abbots, counts, gentlemen, nobles, all the Leipzig professors, many professors from Wittenberg and Erfurt, the magistracy of Leipzig, a large number of Leipzig and Wittenberg masters and students, and many other learned and unlearned people from different parts, making a crowd too large to be accommodated in any hall in Leipzig. None of the three bishops and eleven abbots of Duke George's dominion were present.

This contest was held between two theologians, who at that time were the greatest and most celebrated in the country. Eck was universally acknowledged to be a man of commanding intellect, vast acquirements, wonderful skill in debate, and of logical acumen and incomparably versed, as Luther himself says, in all scholastic theology. He had already disputed at eight Universities, of which he was very proud when Luther artfully gave him this as a reason why he (Eck) was so anxious to dispute with him at Leipzig. The other disputant we need not specialize. He was already at that time well known in all Europe for his learning and talents, but especially for his terrific assaults upon popery. It can then be said with truth of this disputation, as was said by Hornius of that between Luther and Erasmus on Free Will. The affair did not less excite the attention of everybody than when two great mountains rushed against each other in tremendous collision.

The long continuance of the contest was remarkable. It endured nearly three weeks. It began on June 27 and ended on July 15. That especially between Eck and Luther continued from July 4 to July 14. On that day, Carlstadt renewed it with Eck, which was continued to the following Friday, and it would have lasted longer if it had not been necessary, by Duke George's order, to vacate the Pleissenberg that it might be made ready for the reception of the Duke of Brandenburg, on his return from the Frankfort Congress.

The principal subject of the discussion was an unusual one. The primacy of the pope was a doctrine, which at that time was regarded with the most profound reverence by the mightiest

potentates. They all entertained the sentiment uttered by the Emperor Ferdinand I., who as late as 1559, in writing to the pope said, "Ego manus ac pedes vestræ sanctitatis deosculor." Luther thus also writes of it, "Quanta vero papæ majestas, ut metus ejus non regibus terræ modo, sed et, ut ita dicam, cœlo et inferno metuendus esset." It was looked upon as the greatest sin to doubt the power of the pope. He was a bold man who would publicly dispute it. Yet Luther combated it in this discussion and the Dagon fell.

The place where it was held is worthy of remark. It was in a city whose people, university and sovereign, were fanatically devoted to popery. Eck, who boasted "that he could dispute well and overcome his adversary, even if he were drunk," expected to bring Luther to shame in this papal city, and for that reason aided in procuring him a passport. If that had not been the general expectation, Duke George would never have given his consent, and thus draw upon himself the papal displeasure, for the Elector Frederick himself would not have allowed a similar disputation within his territory.*

The locality in which it was held is not undeserving of notice. It was in a princely palace, and in beautifully decorated rooms. Two new stands, or desks, ornamented with carpets, were erected expressly for the occasion. The Pleissenberg in Leipzig has the honor of having this contest, which attracted the attention of all Germany, and a great part of Europe, held within its walls. Duke George ordered the largest hall to be prepared. All the walls and the writing tables were covered with beautiful hangings. The two stands for the disputants, placed opposite to each other, were similarly decorated. That of Wittenberg was designated by a likeness of St. Martin, and that of Eck by one of St. George.†

Is it not remarkable that this hall of fierce contest should be converted into a church and the stands into pulpits? It pleased God that the good seed should be sown into the hearts of the high and the learned, not alone by the discussion, but also into

*Loesch., I. c. S. 537.

†Loesch., *ibid.* S. 508-509. See this sermon in Loesch. III. S. 516 seq.

the hearts of the unlearned and common people by preaching. By a direct act of Providence, it was brought about that Luther preached on St. Peter's and St. Paul's day on Matt. 16: 13-19. This was effected through the agency of Duke Barnim of Pomerania. Luther had so many hearers of this sermon, that he was compelled to preach in the hall, because the castle chapel was too small. He himself mentions that the opposition tried to prevent it, and finally sent several spies to the worship.

It is worth while observing that the predictions of Luther concerning the result of this contest were fulfilled. If he had listened to the apprehensions of his friends, the consequences would have been different. He would have feared that all who had hitherto clung to him, would abandon him because he had undertaken such a perilous and impracticable enterprise. He thus writes to Spalatin: "Res ista finem non accipiet (si ex Deo est) nisi sicut discipuli et noti sui, ita et me derelinquant omnes amici mei." He knew beforehand, that opposition to the primacy of the pope would expose his life to the greatest danger, but he was quite willing to lay down his life for the truth. "In summa si ego perdar, nihil peribit de mundo." But he said in advance, that this contest would result in injury to the papal chair, and that was realized. Until now, he was ready to maintain silence if his enemies would also keep still, and in this very year (1519) he wrote reverentially and obediently to the pope. But the Leipzig disputation infused new energy into the Reformation work. He grasped the subject with increased power. He began to see that Rome was the Babylon of the Revelation. He showed, at Leipzig, on irrefragable grounds, that the power which the pope claims, does not rightfully belong to him, and after the disputation, he demonstrated in many writings the utter groundlessness of the pope's pretensions to supremacy.

The last peculiarity to be mentioned here, is the extraordinary influence this contest had upon the progress of the Reformation. When Luther said, "The affair was not begun in God's name, and will not end in God's name," he was not speaking of himself, as some Romish writers claim, but of Eck. He knew

that Eck was not moved by the love of truth, but by personal ambition and avarice, and hence he wrote to Spalatin, "As Eck and the Leipzigers have sought their own honor and glory in this disputation, and not the truth, it is no wonder that it began badly, was carried on more so, and ended worse." This was exemplified in the subsequent conduct of Eck, who failed to secure certain lucrative ecclesiastical offices, and was so chagrined that he had an interview with Melanchthon upon the expediency of joining the Lutheran party.*

The zealous papist, Duke George, admitted to Luther, at his own table, that he was now convinced, that the papal chair had no claims upon divine appointment. Many Leipzigers were favorably inclined to Luther. Some examples have been given above, such as Mosellanus, Pistoris, Rhaw, Cellarius and others. Matthaeus Hiscollus, a monk, who published a description of the debate, openly gave Luther the right. Poliander, whom Eck brought with him to Leipzig as a sort of reporter, discerned that Eck was in the wrong and soon embraced Lutheranism. He defended Luther in a treatise in 1525. In 1529, he went to Königsberg as preacher. He wrote several fine hymns, and was designated as the *Orpheus of Germany*.

The lecture rooms of Leipzig, soon after the disputation, became silent witnesses of the influence which Luther's words had upon many of the students. A large number of them repaired to Wittenberg to attend the theological lectures of Luther. The University suffered sorely from the loss of pupils, and two years after, on the occasion of a University row, it was almost entirely deserted. It is also very evident that the favorable inclination towards the Lutheran doctrine which was manifested by many inhabitants in the following years, and which Duke George vainly endeavored to extinguish by various severe laws and penalties, were in a great measure the result of this disputation.

It also reflected great honor on Luther himself, especially as his opponent was one of the most learned men of the Romish

*See Seckendorf for this whole interesting story, too long for this paper.

church and particularly familiar with scholastic theology. Besides, if Luther had been allowed a few days time for preparation, he would have been still more powerful, but he came to Leipzig not as a disputant but as a hearer, and was only a hearer until he received the government assurance of protection. And yet, with these disadvantages, he overthrew the difficult doctrine of the pope's supremacy by irrefutable arguments from the Scriptures, the Fathers, and Church history. Even his enemies admitted that he displayed wonderful learning, skill in debate, and brilliant talent. Eck himself, in a letter to the Elector Frederick, praises him for his mental vigor. And Maimbourg expresses this opinion, "The other (Luther) showed much talent and erudition."

In this connection, a small collateral circumstance may be mentioned. Lampadius, the Reformed historian tries to prove that Luther throughout all this discussion was aided by Melanchthon and that it was only through his "suggestions" that Luther gained the victory. It is true that Melanchthon, as a hearer, sometimes forgot himself in his excitement and did interfere by some side remark, which brought from Eck the sharp retort, "Tace tu, Philippe, ac tua studia cura, nec me perturba," but this does not prove that Philip helped Luther all through the contest. Eck is silent on this subject in his letter to the Elector Frederick, and no well grounded complaint would have been overlooked by him, whose piercing eye observed every thing. Neither in any of the reports of the discussion, by friend or foe, is there any allusion to the fact that Luther was indebted to Melanchthon for his arguments or his wit.

Thus in four consecutive years, Luther held four disputations, each one of which could have cost him his life. Subsequently he was engaged in similar contests. Those which were held until 1538 appeared in print during that year. A collection of them extending to 1544, may be found in the Latin Jena edition of his works, pt. I., p. 371-418. In 1545, he wrote three more, two on the Holy Trinity, and one against the theologians of Lyons. This last consists of seventy-six theses. For this, see pt. II. of the Latin Jena edition. Cruciger translated them

into German. Seckendorf in *Hist. Lutheranismi Lib. III. S. cxxviii. fol. 589 seq.* has an epitome.

Thus, a brief summary of these theological contests has been given, and every one of them tends to enhance our admiration of the incomparable champion of the Reformation.

ARTICLE V.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF OLD TESTAMENT MIRACLES.

By Rev. Dr. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Martins Ferry, Ohio.

In theological science no branch has been more conscientiously and successfully cultivated in the last decades than apologetics. This is, in fact, preëminently an age of apologetics. Defence always presupposes an attack, and the prominent role which the defence of Christian truth has assumed is not the result of voluntary choice on the part of theologians, but a necessity forced upon them by the unceasing assaults of infidelity in its many and varied forms, from the aristocratic and learned criticism of Renan and Strauss down to the ignorant and vulgar blasphemies of Ingersoll. It has been, and is yet, to some extent, a question of "To be, or not to be," for Christianity; not this or that shade of Christian belief has been called into question, but the very right of existence has been denied to our religion as such. Fortunately the theological heavens have been cleared of many a dark and threatening cloud, and the sun of truth is again spreading life and light over many of the waste places. In the combat between neological theology and philosophy, falsely so-called, on the one side, and apologetics and faith on the other, the former have steadily lost ground. Many points disputed for years, such as the authorship of the fourth gospel,* the historical character of Christ's life and words, the harmonious spirit of the early Church, have been virtually decided to

* It is certainly a "sign of the times" when men of the independence of Ezra Abbot defend the traditional view of the authorship of the last gospel, as that scholar has recently done in the *Unitarian Review*.

the satisfaction of candid investigators. Consequently, being driven out of the New Testament, the never resting spirit of destruction has taken refuge in the Old, and conservative Christians are now called upon to renew the contest here. What Baur, with his Tübingen school, attempted to prove in regard to Christianity, namely that it originated without any supernatural factor whatever, and was simply a successful combination of the better elements of culture and religion extant at the time of Christ, this his spiritual brother in the department of Old Testament criticism, Kuenen, is trying to establish for the history of the children of Israel. To accomplish this, recourse is had to the theory that whenever the records of the Old Testament indicate any interference of Providence, that is, any miracles great or small, we are dealing not with facts but with myths. But never was a more untenable position taken; for if apologetics have ever proved any thing, it is that in the history of the old covenant there are many authenticated instances of the hand of God guiding and directing the fate of His people; and if the defenders of truth have not proved this, then historical evidences have no value whatever, and nothing that is past is certain. Candid research offers no hope to the deistic spirit which, forgetful of Arago's famous words, "*Celui qui en dehors du mathématiques pures prononce le mot impossible manque de prudence*," has denied the possibility, or reality, of the supernatural events recorded by the prophets and historians of Israel; for if the historical character of one single miracle in these accounts is proved, then their theory is lost, and at least the possibility, if not the probability, of the truth of the others established. Were these extraordinary accounts confined to the book of Genesis and to the earliest history of Israel, long before the invention or general use of written records, then those who scorn to believe in any theory of inspiration whatever would have a plausible ground for their hypothesis; but happily a great number of the most important and greatest miracles are related in those books of the Bible which are based on contemporaneous and official records, so that according to the rules of legitimate research, adopted in the investigation of other histories, a candid mind cannot doubt the truth of what is here pre-

sented. We have here in mind especially the wonderful history of Elijah and Elisha, as found in the second book of the Kings, which book claims to be,—and the claim according to the unanimous voice of critics is just—a reproduction and compilation from the royal annals taken at the time when the events transpired by the official persons appointed for that purpose. Even the most rabid and critical dissects of the Old Testament acknowledge the general historical character of the records since the days of Samuel and Saul, and it is only subjectivism and *a priori* dogmatism when those portions of the later books which speak of a divine interference in the natural course of human events are impugned as unhistorical, while the other portions are regarded as trustworthy, since both are drawn from the same sources by the same author.*

We take it then for granted that really such miracles did occur in the development of Israel's history, that both the myth of old vulgar rationalism, that the authors did not intend to recount supernatural events, and the rationalism of modern mythologists, that we cannot trust the records, are without foundation. This must be insisted upon; for the miracles in the different epochs of O. T. history are an all-important factor, and without them this history would be a body without a soul, an eye without the power of sight. They are important because they constitute a main element in the dealings of God with His own people, and a closer investigation of their purpose and object will soon show that without them Israel would not be the chosen people, and the O. T. not a history of the kingdom of God under the old dispensation.

It is an acknowledged rule of interpretation that, in order to understand and appreciate an author, it is absolutely necessary to place ourselves on his ground, to proceed from his premises, to put ourselves in his place. Especially is the observance of this canon necessary in biblical hermeneutics, for here the introduction of any preconceived notions and theories make a sad

*The miracles of the Bible are in this way better authenticated than any claimed by the sacred books of unchristian religions. With regard to Mohammedanism, in this respect, cf. Tholuck, *Die Wunder Muhammed's*, in *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. ix.

havoc of truth in the exegesis. In studying the object of biblical miracles this rule dare not be lost sight of, since here many of our abstract ideas of God's personality and attributes, and especially the generally received notions about nature and nature's laws, frequently prevent a proper understanding of what God and His holy servants meant by their deeds. Only when we fairly and squarely adopt biblical Theism the views of revelation on God and His relation to the world and to mankind, on the nature of man and his relation to his Creator, on the object of all of God's dealings with the fallen creature, can we hope to understand the reason why the finger of God so frequently appears on the pages of the Old Testament. The refusal to adopt the spirit in the study of our sacred books is the *πρωτότον φεῦδος* of all those methods which see in the miracles there recorded unnecessary or impossible events.

The possibility of supernatural interference on the part of the Creator is given by the uniform view of God in the Old Testament. It knows nothing of stern and strict laws of nature that act independently of God, and over which He has no control, but sees rather in the action of these laws the continuous work of Him who once established them, and even regards each event in the realm of nature an individual act of His freedom. The holy men of the old covenant never asked themselves how miracles were possible and could not regard them as against nature, since these events were nothing but the extraordinary exhibition of the same power that manifested itself in the rising sun, in the falling of rain, and the change of seasons. The difficulties in this regard that now so much trouble deistic and even theistic thinkers never presented themselves to the minds of the prophets. They all presuppose that the power which God showed over nature in the act of creation was still in His hands for any and every purpose, and therefore He is regarded as a God for whom it is natural and characteristic to perform wonders and miracles.* No attribute of God is more strongly emphasized than His omnipotence.† A God who could not inter-

* Cf. among other works, especially Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 537.

† Cf. Joel 2:26; Jer. 32:20; 5:22-24; Job 5:9 sqq.; 9:4 sqq.; 37:14.

vere in the affairs of men and guide their destinies, would not have been "a living God," and the sages and prophets of old would not have understood the definition which Thomas of Aquinas gives of miracles, as embracing the two elements of a *suspensio* and a *restitutio leges naturae*, since all the *leges naturae* were under His will and control. Any act which went beyond the usual course of events was but extraordinary exhibition and intensification of that same omnipotence of God which He daily showed in his dealings with men and in the usual run of nature. It is thus that the Old Testament, regarding God not only as the Creator, but also Preserver of what He created, finds no difficulty in a direct divine interference in the laws of nature; that it regards this interference as necessary, and considers all miraculous events not as purposeless, will easily be seen by its view of man, his destiny and relation to God. The echo of the words that "God created man in His image" resounds through the whole Old Testament, and it teaches that man's destiny is his union with God and the submission of his will to that of his Creator. The creature is to be pure and sinless, obeying from love the commands of his Lord. The picture of the relation between God and man as presented in the beginning of Genesis, when he enjoyed the bliss and innocence of Paradise, is, for all the Old Testament writers, the type of what the destiny of man was to be according to the will of the Creator. Clear as this is to their minds, it is equally clear to them that the purpose of God has been thwarted by the introduction of sin, and any attempt to understand the law and the prophets, without due consideration of this postulate, must signally fail. Clear it is to them also that God does not wish that this rupture shall remain; it is His purpose that a restoration shall be effected, that the head of the serpent shall be trodden on. From these premises the law and prophets set out, and regard all the dealings of God with mankind, but especially with His chosen children, as an effort on His part again to restore what was lost, again to join the broken links of happiness, and make it possible for man, notwithstanding the dire effects of sin, still to reach the good for which they had been destined. As a means in His hands he makes use of miracles, whenever His wisdom regards

them as forwarding this object, and thus all miraculous events have in His hands an ethical and teleological importance.* He thereby shows His love to mankind and His good will for their happiness, and in these exhibitions of His power they are to see invitations to return to Him, and means for effecting this return. The love of God towards fallen humanity which we see in all its glory in that miracle of miracles, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, is also the impelling motive in all other wonders, and this last and greatest miracle is but the culmination of all its predecessors. And as in Christ God desired completely to restore mankind to His household, thus all the miracles that preceded Him were destined to prepare the way, and point to a still greater love which God would show in "the fullness of time." That such is really the object of God in performing these miracles is especially clear from the first few chapters of Exodus where He Himself assigns this as His motive. Proceeding from these biblical grounds we can see the deep meaning of the Psalmist when he demands (Ps. 136:4) that we shall give thanks unto the Lord, and assigns as a reason, that He is the one "who alone doeth great wonders,"† which he regards as a proof of God's *mercy*. The Old Testament thus regards all miracles not as capricious and purposeless actions of God, but as intimately interwoven with His plan of the salvation of mankind, and accordingly the best possible proof of His love, and a reason why the sinner should bow before the Almighty. All that He does is subservient to the one purpose of establishing the kingdom of God among men.

Looking at the miracles in this light, we can also understand one strange phenomenon which neological critics generally prefer to overlook. It is what the careful student of the O. T. must never lose sight of, namely that miraculous events are not related at each and every occasion in the history of the children of Israel, but that they occur periodically. Very frequently there seemed to be and really are generations and even centur-

*Cf. Küstlin, in *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, ix., p. 246, and Christlieb, *Moderne Zweifel*, p. 347 sqq.

†Cf. also Ps. 72:18.

ies in which God does not appear to interfere in Israel's favor any more than in the fate of other nations, and then almost unexpectedly the power of the the Almighty breaks forth and shows itself in all its splendor. The creation of the world manifests the Creator's power, but then that power seems to rest to the days of the deluge; again it is displayed in the life of the patriarchs, but during the stay of the children of Israel for 400 years it seems to have disappeared. Its full glory again shines forth in the exodus, during the stay in the desert, in the capture of the holy land, and to some extent during the rule of the judges. Then there is a blank, and Israel's history is like that of any other nation down to the time of Elijah and Elisha, when miracle followed upon miracle with such rapidity as had scarcely ever been witnessed before. The Old Testament is then, not like the sacred books of other religions in which wonderful events and supernatural interferences are related on every page, increasing in number and incredibility the further back in antiquity they are placed. This peculiarity in the history of the old covenant is full of significance and an important index for understanding the purpose of God in His dealings with men, and at the same time speaks loudly for the truthful character of this history. The general principles above, drawn from the Old Testament itself, explains this peculiarity. It was God's will that the disharmony occasioned by sin should disappear, that men should be restored to their proper sphere and should finally reach the destiny for which He had intended them. For this purpose He established covenants with men, in which the pious pledged themselves to be His servants and do His will, and He promised to be their God and Father, and whenever a miracle occurs its purpose is related to these covenants, either to punish those who have proved faithless, or to advance those for whom there is hope. Under the first category falls the miracle of the deluge, while the translation of Enoch is a voice declaring the fidelity of God to His promises, and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah a warning that in His relations to man God will not be mocked. In this light the Old Testament regards the relation existing between Israel and Israel's God. They are His chosen people whom He has

taken from among the heathen that they should be the bearers of His grace, the medium through which He intended to realize His purpose, the nation out of which should ultimately come the kingdom of God through the Messiah.* Israel is then under the special care and guidance of the Almighty who is training them for His special purpose, and in this training, at certain important stages in its development, He resorts to miracles, when these are apt to bring His people one step nearer to the goal intended. Such important stages in the development of the old covenant are its establishment with Abraham, its renewal and confirmation at Sinai, the invasion of Canaan, and others, and for this reason we find miracles recorded at these periods. This is especially made clear when we consider such important epochs as the 40 years stay in the desert and the later days of the kingdom when the fiery words of the great prophets Elijah and Elisha resounded through the idolatrous land. In the desert God was training His people to become an independent nation, to become conscious of the high mission for which they were intended and prepare themselves thoroughly for the great work which He had assigned to them. For this purpose He miraculously gives them His laws, shows them His power and His earnestness by daily supplying their wants and by the destruction of those who rebelled against the authority of His chosen servants. All the wonders that God showed Israel in those days went to teach them their position and duty towards Him, and in this manner these miracles were instrumental in His laws for the advancement of His purpose for the welfare of sinful humanity. The same purpose is manifest when the two great prophets just mentioned appeared in the northern kingdom. Through the influence of ungodly kings that kingdom had almost entirely fallen away from God and become worshipers of wood and stone, like its neighbors. Then the powers of God, which had seemingly been sleeping for generations and generations, appeared in His servants, and by wonderful deeds these proved that the Jehovah of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was not dead, but called upon His people to

*Cf. Jan. No. of this REVIEW, p. 80.

remain faithful to the covenants and walk in the paths of their fathers. Here again the object of these miracles was to impress a careless people with the fact that they have a special relation to God and that they were in danger of failing in their mission unless they repented and again became obedient to their Lord and King. And if we closely examine the other miracles as we find them recorded we cannot fail to notice that they all have a purpose and all are intended in some way or other to forward the plans of God which He had conceived for the benefit of man.*

For this reason, too, we must strenuously refuse to place the miracles of the Old Testament in the same category with "witchcraft" and "sorcery," as many ignorantly or maliciously have done. These latter all have personal ends and purposes, while all in the Old Testament are instrumental in the hands of the Divinity for His ends. They are all intended for the glory of God, and are announced by those who perform them with this end in view. This must be clear when we regard another peculiarity of these wonders, namely that in the early history of mankind they are never performed by a human being, but always either by God Himself or by his angels. Moses is really the first human being to whom the power of performing miracles has been given. While the greatest miracles, in the beginning and early history of mankind, are the work of the Creator, the second volume certainly shows that here no aggrandizement of this or that human being is intended but that God's power shall be glorified. And in later times the prophets of Israel never seek self-glorification by the wondrous works, but always know themselves to be the medium of the power of Israel's God.

Thus the miracles of the Old Testament virtually subserve the same purpose as those of the New, especially the greatest of all miracles, Christ. Not only the miracles He performed, but also His miraculous nature and character, were all intended to teach the truth that God was a God of mercy who is ever ready to receive penitent sinners, and that He had arranged a

*On some especially difficult miracles, cf. Christlieb, *l. c.*, p. 367, sqq.

plan by which this redemption would take place. The wonders of God in the old covenant, were indeed the shadow of the future substance, but the shadow is so well outlined that even those who had not yet seen the perfection of God's mercy in Christ Jesus, could still recognize in His wonderful guidance and deliverance of His chosen people, a hand that was powerful and ready to save all who would be rescued. And regarding these occurrences as a part of the plan of God for the establishing of His kingdom among men, we certainly should not be so foolish as to regard them as blemishes of the sacred volume, as something for which we are to offer excuses to good common sense, or, if possible, to interpret them out of the Bible. They belong there, and were they not there we would miss something that biblical Theism would demand of us to seek in God's word, for without these miracles the Old Testament might be the history of a certain people called Israel, but would not be the history of a people chosen by God, educated by Him to become the foundation of a kingdom of grace and the home of the Saviour of the world. Certainly he who thinks deistically of God, who knows nothing practically of a living God, will always find these strange histories a stumbling-block, and will vainly seek to understand and appreciate the story of Israel's fate, but when we stand on the basis on which Christ and the pious writers and actors in the Old Testament drama stood, look at these events with their eyes and hear them with their ears of faith, we will have no difficulty in seeing in them the signs of God's wisdom and the manifestation of the Creator's power.

ARTICLE VI.

THE PRACTICAL RELIGION OF THE HINDUS.

By REV. A. D. ROWE, Guntor, India.

The Hindus are preëminently a religious people. They eat religiously, bathe religiously, shave religiously, dress religiously, marry religiously, die religiously, are burned or buried religiously, and, for years to come, certain days are remembered religiously. From morning to night, from day to day, from year to year, and from generation to generation, the Hindus are controlled in almost every act of their lives by their religion. The huge and tyrannous caste system which holds every man in its iron grasp, from the day of his birth to the hour of his death, is but a part of the Hindu religion.

MORALITY.

It must not be supposed that Hindus are moral in proportion as they are religious, or even that morality is a very important part of their religion. Religion and morality in India have long since, alas, parted company, the former continuing to make a grand show, receiving homage, applause and respect, while the latter has been neglected, ill-treated and allowed to find a home and friends as best she could.

Morality without religion is cold and unsatisfactory, but religion without morality is a loathsome blasphemy.

By way of illustration on this point, I give a few instances which have come under my personal observation.

In 1873 a temple was being built in the village of Gottipadu, near Guntor. Hindu temples are generally built by wealthy individuals who erect them for merit. It is seldom that the villagers join together to build them. In this case, however, a number of the prominent men of the village were interested in the erection of the temple, and one day when they wanted charcoal for the blacksmith who was doing the iron work for them, they concluded the cheapest way to get it would

be to appropriate a certain tree which belonged to the public land and burn it. After they had cut down the tree and taken it away a policeman unfortunately came that way and inquired what had become of the missing tree, whereupon the temple-builders declared upon oath that a certain poor man, whom they named, had hewn it down and carried it away. The poor man was arrested, thrown into the police station and would have been sent to jail but for the timely interposition of a Christian teacher who knew the circumstances of the case, and appeared in his behalf.

At another village, not far from my home, a woman had a temple erected. She had called a stone mason from Ongole—60 miles to the South—and when he had done his work she neglected to pay the balance of wages due him. From week to week and from month to month she put him off. Meanwhile she heard of an old debt which the poor man owed to a distant relative of hers and sending for this creditor she soon arranged for the canceling of both debts. The poor stone mason was in great distress and away from his home. On this last occasion he had already waited fifteen days in the hope of getting what was yet due him. When the old debt was turned against him he begged that she would give only enough to buy his food until he could reach his home. To this request the pious devotee replied, that if he would come in ten days she would give him road expenses to his home!

A case was lately brought before the High Court in Madras in which a wealthy Zemindar was accused of instigating a robbery of a man who had acquired a considerable sum of money as a laborer on a foreign island and who had just returned to his native country with his hard earned savings. The instance brought out during the trial to which we call attention, is that one sum of money consisting of two hundred and eleven rupees, was divided among ten men engaged in the robbery giving each man twenty-one rupees, and leaving one rupee over. *This odd rupee was piously set apart for their god.*

HINDUISM.

What is Hinduism? As an immense glacier, slowly descend-

ing from the mountains, gathering up and incorporating stones, earth and *debris* of whatever kind comes into its way, but at the same time accommodating itself to the configuration of the mountain side, so has Hinduism come down through the ages, gathering up and incorporating whatever gods and goddesses, heroes and saints, religious theories and doctrines, rites and ceremonies, came into its way and accommodated itself at the same time, with remarkable flexibility, to whatever influences were too powerful to be overcome by it. What Hinduism is theoretically, it is not our object to discuss. Any standard cyclopædia will furnish the reader with this information, better than he could learn it by a life-time's intercourse among Hindus. Not one in a thousand of them can give an intelligent idea of what he believes, or can state a reason why he observes certain and innumerable rites and ceremonies beyond the all-sufficient one that "it is our custom."

So flexible is Hinduism and in a certain way so tolerant that Christianity, its deadly foe, could at once be incorporated into this huge system if Christians would but consent to have Jesus Christ regarded as one of the innumerable gods of the Hindu pantheon, form a caste subdivision by themselves and pay proper homage to the Brahmins. Regarded in its widest popular sense, we can give no other definition of Hinduism but that it is *the religion of the Hindus*.

THE ANCIENT VEDAS.

What of the ancient *Vedas* or sacred books of the Hindus, whose praise has resounded throughout the whole civilized world?

No more than you can find the pure, sparkling rivulet which was its source, in the muddy, filthy stream as it lazily finds its way, a mighty river, into the sea, can you find in modern practical Hinduism the pure and exalted teachings of the ancient *Vedas*. The millions of India know as little about the *Vedas* as they do about the Bible, or even less. It is not from those grand old books that they have gotten their many gods, their idolatrous rites, their superstitious observances, and their abominable caste. So far as they relate to a divine Being many

of the hymns of the early Hindu *Vedas* are exceedingly pure and sublime—worthy the admiration of all thoughtful minds. Of late years, efforts have been made in certain quarters by intelligent and devout Hindus to lead the nation back to the pure religion of the *Vedas*, but so far their success has not been very encouraging.

BRAHMANISM.

Hinduism and Brahmanism are not interchangeable terms, though they are sometimes so used.

Brahmanism is only a part, but a very important part, of the whole system of Hinduism. Hinduism has been affected and moulded by Buddhism, Mohammedanism, the demon worship of the aborigines, and possibly by Christianity; but it has taken its chief coloring from Brahmanism. Brahmanism rests not upon the ancient *Vedas* but upon the later Hindu so-called sacred writings and to it must be ascribed the origin and maintenance of caste, the subtle pantheistic idolatry of India, the doctrine of the transmigration of souls and the sacerdotal hierarchy.

Brahmanism is utterly selfish, being constructed and maintained in all its features solely for the interests of one class, the Brahmins. To elevate and benefit the masses it has no lessons and influences.

Never was more consummate wisdom displayed by a crafty priesthood than was shown by the Brahmins, who thus perfected a system which should at once secure its own perpetuation and the social and religious supremacy of its founders.

WORSHIP.

Real, spiritual, heart-worship is, we fear, but little known among the Hindus. Wherever found among them it exists in spite of, and not by virtue of, their system of theology.

Their prescribed rites and ceremonies are observed, in a routine way, as matters of duty; their numerous festival days are regarded as holidays rather than as occasions of worship or thanksgiving; their pilgrimages and works of charity are per-

formed confessedly for *merit*; their offerings to the gods are made in payment of vows, or to appease their anger, and their prayers are almost invariably set phrases or vain repetitions.

The names of the gods, as "Rama, Rama, Rama," are repeated hundreds of times in succession, and the account registered by means of a rosary. So efficacious is the repeating of the names of the gods considered, that if even by mistake or accident sounds resembling the names of the gods are uttered, blessings are said to follow.

Such a thing as meeting together with one accord in one place for the united spiritual worship of God is unknown among the Hindus. The caste subdivisions and the utter selfishness of the people would make such assemblies, at present, impossible, and it is probable that the want of this feature in the Hindu religion has contributed in a great measure to bring about this deplorable isolation among the people.

HINDUISM AND THE TRUE GOD.

It has been the fashion with books, of a popular style, to speak of Hinduism only with ridicule and contempt while the Hindus have been put upon a religious level with the savages of Africa and the South Sea Islands.

A late English writer whose book has been republished in America speaks of the Hindus as "Millions of heathen idolaters, living without God and hope in the world, knowing not the Giver of every good and perfect gift," etc. Such language we hold can do no good because it is not true. It may admit of "interpretation," but we fail to see the necessity of writing on so plain a subject in language which needs a commentary.

We are not called upon to defend Hinduism—no sensible man can defend modern Hinduism—but in taking hold only of its ridiculous features and holding these up before the public as *Hinduism* we stultify ourselves, deserve and receive the contempt of thoughtful Hindus, and do no good in the way of reformation. Hinduism as a religious system may deserve our righteous indignation, but if it is only the silly, flimsy, pitiable affair we see so often portrayed in its name, how is it that we have not long since with all our zeal and learning, our men and our

money, ridiculed it out of existence. It is no doubt in the main a system of error, but it is a *gigantic* system and has just enough of truth and utility in it to cement together its spurious parts, and until we apply ourselves to the work of pointing out to the Hindu what use he can make of the valuable parts of his own endeared system in the building up of a new and better one, we shall utterly fail to do him religious good. We must endeavor to put ourselves in his place. He looks upon us as a people with "no religion," while we in pitiable contempt turn to him and call him a heathen with no knowledge of the true God. It is utterly unfair to say that Hindus do not know the true God. They may not have a true and full knowledge of God, their devotion may and does spring from fear rather than from love, they may not have that sweet communion with God which springs from a knowledge of Him as "our Father," and they may be without hope and faith in Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour; they even may and do ascribe to God acts and attributes unworthy of God as the Christian knows Him, but to deny them *in toto* a knowledge of the true God is unjust, and brings no good either to the Christian or the Hindu.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY UPON HINDUISM.

Of all the forces with which Hinduism has hitherto had to contend none has been so strong and vital as Christianity. Christianity is to-day influencing Hinduism in ways undreamed of by Hindus and to an extent scarcely credible to Christians themselves. Christian preachers, mission schools and western books are changing and purifying the whole theological atmosphere of India. The believers in a plurality of gods are fast disappearing, and audiences which were once delighted with the fabled stories of the silly exploits of Rama and Krishna, now laugh at them in derision. The acts of murder, adultery, theft and intrigue which their sacred books ascribe to the hero-gods, are now glossed over, explained away, or skillfully kept in the back ground by the defenders of Hinduism.

Some go so far as to reject all the later sacred books and claim as their religious guide only the ancient *Vedas*, declaring that these teach a spiritual god and salvation by faith.

A discussion has of late been going on among educated natives in Madras, advising the introduction into Hindu schools of a systematic study of Hinduism as taught in the ancient *Vedas*, in order to compete with mission schools on the score of religious instruction. The *Brahmo Samaj*, or Theistic Church of India, with its cry of India for Christ, while its members hold fast with both hands to the ancient *Vedas* and to many doctrines and reservations which are incompatible with the gospel, is but an outgrowth of Christian influence upon Hinduism. All these efforts at religious reformation on the part of Hindus themselves are the fruit of Christian missionary effort—fruit, however, which like the sickly apple ripening before its time, is stunted, diseased and tasteless and not to be compared with that which is yet to ripen for Christ and His Church in India.

ARTICLE VII.

THE PALATINE PARISH BY QUASSAICK.*

By REV. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y.

The Palatinate was a portion of Germany lying upon the Rhine. It has been divided and incorporated with Bavaria and the states of Rhenish Prussia, Baden and Hesse Darmstadt. It was a section which early embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, and the Elector was one of its earnest advocates and friends. Protestants from other countries flocked to the Palatinate to enjoy that religious protection which they failed to secure at home.

The Palatinate suffered largely in the wars in the time of Louis XIV. In 1674 a French army entered its territory and marked its advance by acts of the greatest wantonness and

*The title of this article is the corporate name given in the patent for the lands donated to the Palatines who settled at Quassaick Creek in Orange county, N. Y. Our information is chiefly derived from the Documentary History of New York, Johnson's Reports of Cases in the Supreme Court and Mr. Ruttenber's History of Orange county.

destruction. From his castle at Manheim the Elector saw two cities and twenty-five towns in flames. Turenne, the French commander, was finally forced to retreat from the territory, and the Palatinate enjoyed prosperity, until in 1683, the edict of Nantes, which had protected the Protestants was annulled, when the unfortunate territory was marked on account of its Protestant sentiments for especial vengeance. Learning that Austria and Holland intended to commence hostilities against France, the king of the latter country dispatched his son, the Dauphin, to invade the Palatinate with a hundred thousand men. The sudden blow was successful, and when several cities had succumbed to the power of the invaders, an order came from the government that the Palatinate should be reduced to cinders and the country be converted into a desert.

The order was peremptory, and the Dauphin notified the inhabitants that in three days the work of destruction would commence. The people had no time to turn their property into money—they gathered up what little they could and fled. Their dwellings were burned and men, women and children were driven to the fields in mid winter. Over forty cities, besides a much larger number of villages were burned. Europe gazed in horror upon the scene of pillage, cruelty and destruction.

Tens of thousands of the impoverished fugitives scattered over Europe. They went to Protestant countries where they naturally looked for sympathy and aid in the calamities which so suddenly darkened the whole horizon of their lives. Those who remained around the ruined cities and villages of their native land were reduced to abject poverty and want, and many years rolled by before the damage of a few days could be repaired.

Protestant England felt a lively interest and sympathy for these good people, who had suffered such barbarities on account of their religion, and the government acted a humane and noble part in aiding the Palatines who came there, to new homes in her colonies in the western world.

A vanguard of forty-one Palatines including their pastor, Rev. Joshua Kockerthal, went to England in the spring of 1708.

At the Queen's Court in Council, on the 10th of May in that year, a Report was read, dated April 28th, from the Lord Commissioners of Trade and Plantations, in which they inform the Queen and her Council that they had, in accordance with her Majesty's command, "considered the petition of Joshua Kockerthal, the Evangelical Minister, in behalf of himself and several poor Lutherans, come hither from the Lower Palatinate in Germany, praying to be transferred to some of your Majesty's plantations in America. We humbly take leave to represent to your Majesty that they are in number forty-one, viz.: ten men, ten women and twenty-one children."

The Report further states that they were very necessitous,—that they were dependent upon charity—that they had been reduced to this condition by the ravages committed by the French in the Lower Palatinate—that they brought good testimonials of character from magistrates in their native land, which by the aid of Lutheran ministers in London had been examined; and it was finally recommended that they be settled upon the Hudson River in the Province of New York; provided with tools for agriculture; aided from the public treasury for a year until they could raise a crop; that they be made denizens of the kingdom; and that to save expense they be sent to the new world in a ship of war.

This Report was fully approved, and it was ordered that they be made denizens of the kingdom under the royal signature and great seal and that no fees or charges be made to them for these "Letters of Denization." Queen Anne herself provided at her own expense for their removal to America and their maintenance. They were to receive nine pence a day *per capita* for a year, at the end of which time it was supposed they would be able to provide for themselves. Letters of Denization were issued to them on the 25th of August, 1708. On the 10th of August, H. Boyle, Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State, wrote to Lord Lovelace, who was at that time Governor of New York, "The Queen having graciously pleased to send fifty-two German Protestants to New York, and to settle them there at her own expense—Her Majesty, as a further act of charity, is willing to provide also for the subsistence of Joshua Kockerthal,

their minister, and it is her pleasure that you pass a grant to him of a reasonable portion of land for a glebe, not exceeding five hundred acres, with liberty to sell a suitable proportion thereof for his better maintenance till he shall be in a condition to live by the produce of the remainder."

They reached New York in the winter and were subsequently transferred up the Hudson river about sixty miles, just beyond the Highlands, to a district then known as "Quassaick Creek and Thans-Kamir"—now the city of Newburgh. The family of their leader, Rev. Joshua Kockerthal, consisted of himself, Sibylle Charlotte, his wife, and their children, Christian Joshua, Benigna Sibylle and Susanna Sibylle.

Originally the number mentioned was forty-one—these were increased to fifty-two at the time they left England, and on reaching their destination they were represented in the official documents at forty-seven.

On the 26th of May, 1709, and after the death of Lord Lovelace, a petition was presented to the State Council from Rev. Joshua Kockerthal, Herman Schuneman, and other Germans, stating that after the death of the Governor, the provision for their maintenance had not been complied with—that they were in want, and that without the public provision made, they could not perfect their settlement. The Council made immediate provision for their assistance to continue, as ordered in the letter of Mr. Boyle to Gov. Lovelace—"a needful and necessary support until the expiration of twelve months." In their petition they also stated that nineteen of their number had "changed their religion, become *Pietists*, and withdrawn themselves from the communion of the minister and the rest of the Germans." Mr. Van Dam, Mr. Barbarie and Captain Provost were appointed a committee to inquire into the disputes between the Germans, which it seems were subsequently satisfactorily arranged. The Council also made an allowance of twenty pounds a year to Rev. Mr. Kockerthal.

In the spring of 1710 there was a distribution of tools and building material among the colonists, including smith-tools, nails, iron and steel for horse shoes, agricultural implements and horses, cows and swine.

On the 30th of April, 1713, Robert Hunter, who had become Governor of the Province, issued his warrant to Augustus Graham, Surveyor General, as follows: "You are hereby required to survey and lay out for the Germans at Quassaick Creek, in the county of Ulster, such quantity of land as is petitioned for by them, and approved of in Council by a report confirmed, and that you survey for each of them his quantity distinctly, and of what you shall have done therein to make returns unto me in Council."

A survey under this order was made on the 13th of April, 1714, and on the 17th of June, in the same year, George Lockstaedt, in behalf of the colonists, petitioned Gov. Hunter that the Surveyor General might be directed to give them additional land a mile in the rear of the survey, as that surveyed was all "upland," and they needed some "meadow" land for fodder for their cattle in winter. This petition does not seem to have been granted.

The patent for the lands for the Palatines was finally issued by the state government on the 18th of December, 1719. It consisted of 2190 acres, 500 of which were reserved for a glebe, and the remainder was divided into nine lots and distributed as follows: George Lockstaedt and family, 250 acres; Michael Wiegand and family, 250 acres; Herman Schuneman and wife, 100 acres; Christian Henricke, 100 acres; widow Joshua Kockenthal and children, 250 acres; Berger Meynders, 100 acres; Jacob Webber and family, 200 acres; Johannes Fischer and wife, 100 acres, and Andries Volck and family, 300 acres. Forty acres were reserved for highways. The glebe of 500 acres lay in the middle of the tract, which bounded the river on the east and ran back in lines at a right angle with the river. On the south side of the glebe were five lots, and on the north side four lots.

Of the settlers, Mr. Ruttenber, in his history of the county of Orange says, "Of their private history we know nothing beyond the fact shown before the commissioners of trade, that they were men of good character, and the general fact that they had been stripped of their possessions by religious persecution; that they were followers of the doctrines of Luther and members

of the Lutheran Church, and were knit together by common memories and a faith that had proved sufficient to sustain them amid the most severe sacrifice and trials. Unlike the pioneers in other localities, they brought nothing with them, and left behind no friends able to assist them. A scanty public stipend, too frequently withheld, was all that sustained the strong arms and willing hearts, before which the dense forest yielded its sway, their humble cabins dotted the hillside, and a sanctuary in which to worship God arose."

These lands were conferred upon the colonists in fee, and to their heirs forever, subject to a rent to the state of twenty shillings for every hundred acres.

By letters patent issued in the name of "George, by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.", Andries Volck and Jacob Webber were made Trustees of the glebe of five hundred acres, "*for the use of the Lutheran Minister and his successors forever.*" It is again mentioned in the letters patent, "*and that the five hundred acres thereof laid out for a glebe, be set apart and appropriated towards the maintenance of a Lutheran Minister and his successors forever.*"

The letters patent further provided that in case of the death or disability or absence of either of the Trustees, the male inhabitants of the 2190 acres should assemble and choose his successor, and that these Trustees and their successors be a corporation to be known in law as the Trustees of "The Palatine Parish by Quassaick" with power to sue and be sued.

Rev. Joshua Kockerthal was dead when the letters patent were issued for the land to the colony. The preceding year he had sent a petition to Governor Hunter, so that his decease must have occurred in 1718 or 1719. He was succeeded by Rev. Justus Falkner, who founded the Lutheran Church at Athens, then called Loonenburgh, in 1704, and in whose handwriting the record of their church begins. Mr. Falkner died in 1723. He also ministered to the Lutherans in New York city.

In 1725, Rev. William Christopher Berkenmeyer arrived at New York, and in connection with other points he became pastor of the Quassaick Church. He resided at Athens, and in the

records of that church are included the ministerial acts performed at Quassaick and also at Albany. Mr. Berkenmeyer's pastoral labors also included New York city. He died at Athens and his remains were deposited beneath the church. On putting up a new building in 1853, the stone which covered his remains was placed upright in the brick wall of the vestibule between the two doors. It bears an inscription comprising a mixture of Greek, Latin and Low Dutch.

Andries Volck and Jacob Webber, the two first Trustees sold their lots and moved to Pennsylvania. They were succeeded in the trusteeship by Zacharias Hofman and Tobias Weigand. These entered into a written contract with the Lutheran congregation in New York city, by which the Palatine Parish at Quassaick was received into the communion of the former, and agreed to receive Rev. W. C. Berkenmeyer as the lawful teacher of the Parish of Quassaick. He was to visit them twice a year, going to and coming from Albany, for which he was to receive the annual income of the glebe. By the contract he was to minister, "after the manner aforesaid, as well in preaching the Holy Gospel purely, according to the Holy Scripture and the Symbolical Books of our Lutheran Church, as in administering the Holy Sacraments and practicing the usual ceremonies of the fellow-believers of the unaltered Confession of Augsburg."

The contract further stated that as they had no use for the bell, presented to their parish by Queen Anne, with the oral permission of Gov. Burnett it was given to the church in New York, on condition that when they became able to build a church, it was to be returned, or one of the same weight and value to be sent. The church in New York was never to leave them destitute of a minister, unless the church in New York should call one who was not loyal to the unalterable (unaltered?) Augsburg Confession. This contract was signed by Zacharias Hofman and Tobias Weigand, Trustees of the glebe, on the one hand, and the Minister and Consistory of the Protestant Lutheran Church of the city of New York on the other.

Thus on the 30th of March, 1727, the colonists had not as yet secured a house of worship, and had but two services a year for which they paid Rev. Mr. Berkenmeyer thirty cheepels of

wheat. In 1726 there was a misunderstanding between the pastor and the Palatines in regard to the produce of the glebe—the former wrote to the Governor for redress, which he declined to give, and directed him to the courts of law, but the matter was settled without such a resort.

Mr. Berkenmeyer served as pastor until 1731. In 1733 he was succeeded by Rev. Michael Christian Knoll, who served at New York, Hackensack, Quassaick Creek and Weapon's Creek. He visited the Palatines twice a year and received for his services thirty cheepels of wheat. During his administration the Palatines built their church—an edifice about twenty feet square, with a roof running up from the four sides, and reaching a point in the middle where a cupola, or belfry, was constructed to receive the bell—the gift of Queen Anne, which had been loaned to the church in New York. The building had neither floor nor chimney but there was an opening beneath the cupola where smoke and foul air could escape.

The Palatines were mostly farmers, and in their native land they had tilled better lands than the sterile Quassaick hills, and they became dissatisfied with the location. Some sold their lots and went to Pennsylvania, and sent back reports that they had found rich and fertile lands. George Lockstedt and Michael Weigand sold Lot No. 1 and half of No. 2 to Nathan Smith. Michael Weigand sold the other half of Lot No. 2 to William Brown. Herman Schuneman sold Lot No. 3 to James Alexander. Christian Heuneche sold Lot No. 4 to William Brown. Mrs. Kockerthal's children sold Lot No. 5 to James Smith. Burger Mynders sold Not No. 6 to Burras Holmes. Lots 7, 8, and 9 were sold by their owners to Zacharias Hofman.

By the year 1743, Quassaick, which in 1709 was a German settlement, had passed to the control of the Scotch and English. The lots had been divided into smaller parcels, and a larger number of families occupied the territory. The original inhabitants had largely moved away, but some remained, and also their descendants, and occupied smaller areas of the original territory.

Rev. Mr. Knoll continued to perform his duties as pastor of the congregation. In 1744, Zacharias Hofman, one of the Trus-

tees, died, and his place was filled by Burger Mynders, Jr., a son of one of the immigrants, and the trusteeship of Tobias Weigand, a descendant of one of the original lot owners, was anew confirmed as a Trustee of the glebe land, according to the charter. The church record says that at this election, "none of the English and Dutch new inhabitants appearing, although they were knowing to our election."

These "new inhabitants" were looking with a covetous eye upon this glebe of 500 acres, which had been granted by royal letters patent, sealed with the Great Seal of the Province of New York and "*set apart and appropriated toward the maintenance of a Lutheran Minister and his successors forever.*"

On the 2nd of July, 1747, the "new inhabitants" held a meeting and ignoring the election held by the Lutherans, and the trusteeship of Burger Mynders, Jr., and Tobias Weigand, they elected Alexander Colden and Richard Albertson as Trustees, who at once assumed charge of the church and took immediate steps to have its pulpit occupied by Rev. Hezekiah Watkins, a minister of the church of England, who was stationed in the district.

This was a sharp practice on the poor Lutherans by the "new inhabitants"—a most inexcusable outrage. The church record says, "anno 1747, the 2nd of July, the now being inhabitants, assembling did elect, by their own authority, in the absence of the minister, Alexander Colden, Esq., and Richard Albertson for their Trustees; taking possession of the tenants and the church. Our minister coming there did preach the 12th of July in his church without speaking with the new Trustees. Hearing that they would make use of our church with force, our minister did write to Mr. Colden and Mr. Albertson, to know by what authority they had proceeded in the manner, with protest against their doings."

"Sunday the 19th of July the church was full of people, taken out of the country from both sides of the river. Some Justices of the Peace and some with swords and sticks were there in the church in presence of the English minister, Mr. Watkins, who was come there to preach the first time the same Sunday. Our minister, after oral and public protest at the door of the church

went into a private house upon the glebe, to do divine worship for the Lutherans."

The tradition is that the Lutherans attempted the forcible ejection of the "new inhabitants" from the church, but failed—that in the encounter the door of the church was forced from its hinges and buried one stalwart Lutheran beneath it as it fell, but that he escaped without serious injury. Thus the "new inhabitants" became masters of the situation.

The church record says "in the year 1748, July 2nd, our minister was by Mr. Albertson to ask if they have received authority for their pretended possession and also by Mr. Colden too. Upon their negative he did protest again and preached in the church the 3rd of July, which Mr. Albertson did consent, because the English minister was not to come there that Sunday, but Mr. Colden did prohibit the church, not being willing to allow preaching."

On the 2nd of October, 1748, Mr. Knoll preached in the church without asking the new Trustees. In 1749 the church was locked against the Lutheran minister and he did not go on shore in his passage up and down the river. The last visit of Rev. Michael Christian Knoll, in his capacity as pastor of the church, appears to have been on the 2nd of October, 1748.

This wrongful action of the "new inhabitants," in depriving the Lutherans of their church and the income of their glebe did not pass without protest on the part of the oppressed. On the 12th of May, 1749, Rev. Mr. Knoll and the officers of the Lutheran church in New York, signed a petition, which was presented to Gov. George Clinton and read in council. The petition is entitled, "The petition of Michael Christian Knoll, Minister of the Lutheran Protestant Congregation in the city of New York and the Consistory of the said Church."

In this petition they recite the facts of the persecutions of the Palatines in their native land—their refuge in England—the kindness of Queen Anne—the letters patent of King George I. granting them 2190 acres of land, at a place called Quassaick, in Ulster county, of which 500 acres were granted to Trustees for the use, behoof and benefit of a Lutheran minister forever—that the grantees entered upon their lands—that for many years

on account of their poverty, they could make little improvement upon the glebe, and contribute but little for the support of religion and the public worship of God—that during these years the Lutheran congregation at New York, at their sole expense supplied them twice a year by their minister, who at stated seasons attended upon them to preach and administer the holy sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper—that no profits could arise from the glebe until within about sixteen years, last past—that for thirty years the Lutheran ministers of New York had not received more than five hundred sheepels of wheat—that in 1727 the patentees became incorporated with the Lutheran congregation of New York by contract mutually executed—that the Lutherans had built a small church upon the glebe—that the Lutherans living upon the lands had been reduced in number, having sold their lands and bought elsewhere—that the present inhabitants had deprived the petitioners "of the said church and glebe, and have lately hindered your petitioner, Michael Christian Knoll from performing divine service in it, and forbade the tenants from paying the rent to your said petitioner, pretending that the said glebe and church had reverted to the crown for want of Lutheran inhabitants to enjoy them, notwithstanding your petitioners do aver, that within a convenient distance from the said lands as great a number of Lutheran families and persons are living as are sufficient to make a congregation for divine service, at those times when your petitioner, Michael Christian Knoll is called to preach at that place."

This petition was signed by Michael Christian Knoll, Charel Beekman, Laurens Van Boskerk, George Peterson, Johann David Wolff, and Jacobus Van Boskerk.

Gov. Clinton having intimated that more points should be laid before him, on the 5th of October, 1749, Mr. Knoll, and the officers of the New York church, sent another petition accompanied by documents. These included (1) the letters patent issued to the Lutherans for the glebe in 1719. (2) The manner in which the ministers of New York had observed the service of worship from time to time. (3) The authority by which the Lutheran Ministers had served at Quassaick, viz., by indulgence of the Governors of the Province, and by request of the Trus-

tees of the glebe and contract with the church in New York. (4) An extract of the circumstances in which the inhabitants living there, English Presbyterians and Dutch Reformed, have taken possession of the church and church land there.

The petition says, "whereof it appears that Burger Mynders, our one Trustee, having sold his land too, he being the last of they, there settled Lutheran inhabitants on the 2190 acres, and he being removed at the Walenkill, and our second Lutheran Trustee, being one of the tenants upon the glebe; the new inhabitants think to be master of the glebe and have locked up the church there, meaning that your most humble petitioner, nor the said old Trustees, not have any right at the glebe, for want of Lutheran settled inhabitants upon the 2190 acres, although there live as tenants upon the glebe and there about, on both sides of the river more than thirty families of our Protestant Confession, and higher at Bachwaik thirty families more. Therefore, as in the former petition, your excellency's ordering and will is humbly prayed for, that the said 500 acres of land may be granted unto our church in New York, for the use, benefit and behoof of the families round about Quassaick, though they are not settled inhabitants upon the 2190 acres, that they may there congregate at Quassaick glebeland or upon any convenient place, and may have their own, and old Trustees under them, in corporation with the church in New York, to the end that they may perform their sacred service without envy, hatred and scandal."

This petition was read before the Governor and Council on the 29th of October, 1749, and the entry was made, "read and Council of opinion that nothing can be done on this petition."

Thus the Lutherans failed to get the redress to which they were equitably entitled from the state. In the charter it was provided, "but to and for the sole and only proper use, benefit, and behoof of a Lutheran Minister to serve and have care of the inhabitants of the same 2190 acres of land, their successors forever."

The "new inhabitants" getting the majority, ignored the Trustees and elected Colden and Albertson, who shut the church against the Lutheran Minister, collected rent from the tenants

of the glebe, and put an Episcopal Minister in charge, of the church although there were Lutheran tenants upon the glebe lands, and sixty Lutheran families within a reasonable distance of the church. An appeal from this usurpation to the Governor and Council of State failed to bring redress, and there does not appear to have been any appeal to the courts. If the charter had directed *the church* to choose Trustees for the glebe land, instead of making the inhabitants of the patent the electors, this state of things would not have occurred and these wanton and unconscionable proceedings would not have succeeded. But under the technicality of the letters patent, the conspiring against the rights of the Lutherans was formed and carried to a successful issue, and they were ousted from a glebe given in perpetuity for the support of a Lutheran minister, and the lands were seized and occupied by parties who were never contemplated by the original conveyance. Had there been a resort to the courts they might have ordered that in conformity with the charter, the Trustees, whoever they might be, should devote the income of the glebe to the support of a Lutheran minister, and that the church be maintained as a Lutheran church. But litigations are costly, and these poor colonists were probably not able to prosecute their rights in the tribunals of the Province, and so the gift they had secured and enjoyed for thirty years, was wrested from their hands by overpowering force, under the forms of law.

Colden and Albertson, the pretended Trustees of the glebe, Sept. 6th, 1751, petitioned the Governor and Council to grant the glebe land, of which they assumed to be the Trustees, for the support of a minister of the Church of England, and the support of a schoolmaster. In this petition, a number of other persons united, and they represented that the Palatines had moved into the county of Albany and other parts. They requested that 200 acres be reserved for the use of a minister and schoolmaster, and that 300 acres be divided into one acre lots and leased in perpetuity, instead of being limited to a term of seven years as heretofore; and that they have the privilege of holding a Fair on the lands on the second Tuesdays of April and October annually.

Notwithstanding the earnest remonstrances of the Lutherans,

the Governor ordered the Attorney General, William Smith, Esq., to draft letters patent to Alexander Colden and Richard Albertson for the glebe lands, in accordance with the terms of the petition, "said Alexander Colden and Richard Albertson, as first Trustees, during their natural lives and to their successors forever, for the sole use and behoof of a minister of the Church of England, as by law established, and a schoolmaster, to have the care of souls and the instruction of the children of the neighboring inhabitants."

On the 26th of March, 1752, these letters patent were issued to Alexander Colden and Richard Albertson, and they made a legal surrender of the lands they held as Trustees, under what was known as the German patent, and thus the glebe lands of the Lutherans, held by them under letters patent under the Great Seal of the Province of New York, passed by sharp practice and legerdemain into the hands of the Episcopalians.

Here endeth the first lesson.

The Lutheran "Palatine Parish by Quassaick" had under the new charter become the Episcopal "Parish of Newburgh." Rev. Mr. Watkins was assigned the use of 100 acres of the glebe land and the schoolmaster 100 acres. The remaining 300 acres were divided into lots of one acre each, and rented in perpetuity, at an annual rent of five shillings each. In course of time, Rev. Mr. Hawkins was succeeded by Rev. John Sayer, who resigned in 1775, and during the revolutionary war the church had no pastor. In 1785, Rev. George H. Spierin became rector and schoolmaster, and officiated until 1793.

In the meantime other "new inhabitants," who were not Episcopalians had become owners of part of the 2190 acres of the patent. The charter granted to Colden and Albertson in 1752 had the same provision as the first patent, that in case of a vacancy in the trusteeship the male inhabitants, twenty-one years of age and upwards, should elect a successor or successors. An opposition to the Episcopal church developed itself among the "new inhabitants." In the meantime the membership of the Episcopal church dwindled away until few of that denomination remained. The public demanded that the in-

come of the glebe be devoted entirely to the support of schools, and that it be no longer divided between them and the Episcopal minister. This the old Trustees refused to do, whereupon the "new inhabitants" called a meeting and elected new Trustees. These new Trustees had an act passed by the Legislature on the 6th of April, 1803, entitled, "an act to alter and amend the charter of the glebe land in the *German* patent in the village of Newburgh," which provided for the election of three Trustees annually, to be chosen by persons who have the right to vote at the annual town meetings in the village of Newburgh, and that all the money arising from the annual income of the glebe be appropriated solely to the support of schools. Two hundred dollars were to be paid annually to the Newburg Academy. After providing that the income of the glebe shall be appropriated *solely* for the support of schools on said glebe, the act says, that, "if at any time hereafter a minister of the Episcopal church shall be inducted on said patent, as nearly in conformity to said charter as may be, then it shall and may be lawful for the said Trustees of the glebe to pay annually for the support of said minister, such proportion of the monies aforesaid, as shall be reasonable, according to the true intent and meaning of said charter."

It appears that the Trustees obeyed the first part of the act, and did not use the privilege of the closing sentences. The "new inhabitants" took the same advantage of the Episcopalian that they had taken of the Lutherans. In an action at law subsequently brought by the Episcopalian, and to which we shall refer later in this article, Thomas Addis Emmet, the celebrated Irish lawyer, in his points for the defense said, "The Episcopalian in 1752 acted in the same manner toward the Lutherans, as the Presbyterians in 1803 acted towards the Episcopalian."

Mr. Ruttenber in his History of Orange County says: "In this way the revenues of the glebe passed from the control of the Episcopal Church. History repeated itself. The very means—the elective franchise conferred on the inhabitants by the charter—which the Episcopalian had employed to wrest the privileges of the patent from the Lutherans, had been successfully used for their own overthrow in the hour of similar

numerical weakness. The glebe passed now wholly into the hands of the people, and its limited but useful system of free education was divested of sectarian control."

Here endeth the second lesson.

On the 4th of November, 1805, Rev. Cave Jones, a regular clergyman of the Episcopal Church was chosen, called and inducted to serve as a minister and officiate on the glebe. He was called by persons claiming to be the Trustees of the "Parish of Newburgh," with the consent of all the Episcopalians residing on the patent. On the same day all the males twenty-one years of age residing upon the glebe were notified of an election for Trustees of the "Parish of Newburgh," but those conducting the election would not allow any but Episcopalians to vote, although they comprised less than one-tenth of the inhabitants.

Rev. Cave Jones demanded the possession of the parsonage lot or glebe which was then occupied by Michael Nestles as tenant of the Trustees elected under the act of the Legislature of 1803. He refused to yield the posession and an action in ejectment was brought in the name of the Rector, Church Wardens, &c., of St. George's church in the Parish of Newburgh: The Trustees of St. George's church in said Parish: The Trustees of the Parish of Newburgh and Cave Jones.

The action came to trial at the Orange County Circuit on the 26th of November, 1806. The plaintiffs claimed that the possession of the premises belonged to Rev. Cave Jones, an Episcopal minister duly inducted, as rector of St. George's church in the parish of Newburgh. On the trial they produced the charter granted by George II., dated March 26, 1752, to Alexander Colden and Richard Albertson. They alleged that 100 acres of the glebe had been set off for the use of Rev. Mr. Watkins, and that it had been in possession of his successors until 1793. They also alleged that on the 4th of Nov., 1805, notice of an election for trustees of the glebe had been given to all the male inhabitants of the glebe twenty-one years of age and upwards, and that the trustees represented as plaintiffs in the action had been chosen. Upon this statement they demanded the possession of the premises.

On the part of the defence the act of the Legislature of 1803

was presented, providing for an election of three trustees and the appropriation of the income of the glebe to school purposes. It was also alleged that, at the election mentioned, none but Episcopalians were allowed to vote, although the charter gave that right to all the male inhabitants of full age residing upon the glebe lands. It was also stated that the defendant, Michael Nestles, held his possession by authority of the three trustees chosen in pursuance of the act of the Legislature. The defendant, on this state of facts, moved for and obtained a non-suit.

The case was appealed to the Supreme Court and a motion made to set aside the non-suit on the ground, 1. That by the charter of 1752 none but Episcopalians were qualified to vote or eligible as Trustees of the Parish of Newburgh. 2. That by the constitution of the State, none but Episcopalians could vote for or be elected as Trustees under the said charter. 3. That the act of the Legislature altering the charter was unconstitutional. 4. That the Episcopalians residing on the patent not having united in petition to the Legislature for such act, nor acquiesced in it or acted under it, could not be affected by it. 5. That the 100 acres having been set apart for the use of an Episcopal minister, Rev. Cave Jones was entitled to the possession. 6. That if Rev. Cave Jones as such rector was not entitled to the premises, the Trustees of the Parish of Newburgh were so entitled.

On the argument the attorney of the Episcopalians urged that if every male inhabitant of the age of twenty one, without regard to his religious profession be entitled to vote, then the church could be kept vacant forever and the intention of the charter be defeated.

Mr. Emmet for the defense said, "If none but persons of the same religious denomination with those named in the original grant had a right to vote, then the Episcopalians in 1752 had no right to elect Trustees."

In the opinion delivered by Judge Van Ness he said,* "The defendant is in possession under the Trustees elected pursuant

* 3 Johnson's Reports, 115.

to the act of 1803. I intend that he is in possession under a lease, sealed with the corporate seal; and those Trustees as it respects this portion at least of the lands belonging to the corporation must be regarded as the Trustees *de facto*. They were elected *before* the other set of Trustees under an existing law of the Legislature and until they are ousted the court is bound to protect the possession of their tenant."

Many of the questions raised were not passed upon by the court, including the constitutionality of the act of the Legislature, but the action of the court below in ordering a non-suit was affirmed.

As the Episcopalians had meted to the Lutherans so it was measured to them.

Here endeth the third lesson.

ARTICLE VIII.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*The Longer Epistles of Paul*, Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians, by Rev. H. Cowles; *Life and Writings of St. John*, by Jas. M. Macdonald, D. D., edited with Introduction by Rev. J. S. Howson, new edition; *Discussions in History and Theology*, by George P. Fisher, D. D.; *The Saviour's Converts*, by Rev. Wm. Scribner; *The Origin and Growth of the Psalms*, by Prof. T. C. Murray; *Jesus of Nazareth*, embracing a brief sketch of Jewish History to the time of His birth, by E. Clodd; *Fragments, Religious and Theological*, collection of independent papers relating to various points of Christian life and doctrine, by D. Curry, D. D.; *The Old Testament with Brief Commentary*, by various authors—Prophetic Books, Isaiah to Malachi; *The True Story of the Exodus of Israel*, with brief history of Monumental Egypt, compiled from the work of Dr. H. Brugsch-Bey, edited with introduction and notes by Francis H. Underwood; *Six Addresses on the being of God*, by C. J. Ellicott, D. D.; *Origin and Growth of Religion* as illustrated in the religion of ancient Egypt (Hibbert Lectures) by P. le Page Renouf; *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, by E. H. Plumptre, Handy Commentary edited by C. J. Ellicott, D. D.; *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, with notes and introduction by F. W. Farrar, the eleventh book of the Cambridge Bible, J. J. S. Perowne, D. D., general editor; *Titus to Revelation*, vol. 5. of Commentary on N. T., for popular use, by D. D. Whedon; *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, by J. Caird; *The Gospel Mir-*

acles in their relation to Christ and Christianity, by W. M. Taylor, D. D.; *Sabbath Essays*, papers and addresses presented at Massachusetts Sabbath Conventions, Boston and Springfield, edited by Rev. W. C. Wood; *The Immortal Life*, by John Weiss; *The Foundation of Faith* considered in Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1879, on the lecture foundation by John Bampton, by Henry Wace, M. A., chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Prof. of Eccl. Hist. in King's College.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Fundamental Concepts* of modern philosophic thought, critically and historically considered, by Rudolph Eucken, translated by M. Stuart Phelps, with additions and corrections by author, and introduction by Noah Porter; *Socialism*, with Preludes on Current Events, Boston Monday Lectures, by Joseph Cook.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*Lord Beaconsfield*, his Life, Character and Works, by George Brandes, translated by Mrs. George Sturge, *Germany, Past and Present*, by S. Baring-Gould; *Life and Writings of H. T. Buckle*, by Alfred H. Huth; *Memories of My Exile*, by Louis Kossuth; *Life and Work of W. A. Muhlenberg*, by Anne Ayres; *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, by S. Baring-Gould; *Life of H. R. H. the Prince Consort*, by Theodore Martin, vol. 5, completing the work; *Life of Mozart*, by Ludwig Nohl, tr. from the German, by J. J. Lalor; *Bonaparte's Park and the Murats*, by E. M. Woodward; *An Outline of the Public Life and Services of Thomas F. Bayard*, Senator of U. S. from the State of Delaware, 1869–1880, with extracts from his speeches and the Debates of Congress, by Edward Spener; *The Congregationalism of the last 300 years as seen in its Literature*, with special reference to certain recondite, neglected or disputed passages, in 12 lectures delivered on the Southworth Foundation in the Theol. Seminary, Andover, Mass., in 1876–1879, with a biographical appendix, by Henry Martin Dexter; *Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell*; *A History of Classical Greek Literature*, by the Rev. J. P. Mahaffy, M. A., fellow and professor of ancient history, Trinity College, Dublin; *The Witness of the Heart to Christ*, being the Hulsean Lectures preached before the University of Cambridge in the year 1878, by the Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, M. A., Vicar of Christ Church, Lancaster Gate, and Hon. Chaplain to the Queen; *The Pulpit Commentary*, edited by Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence and Rev. Jos. X. Exell,—Ruth—Exposition and Homiletics by Rev. Jas. Morrison, D. D., homilies by various authors.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Fallacies about Total Abstinence* considered, Speech before the Church of England Temperance Association in Liverpool, Feb. 13, 1880, by F. W. Farrar; *Our Common School System*, by M. Abigail Dodge ("Gail Hamilton"); *The Watering Places and Mineral Springs of Germany, Austria and Switzerland*, with notes on Climatic Resorts and Sanitariums, Peat, Mud and Sand Baths, Whey and Grape Cures, etc., with maps and illustrations, by Edward Gutman, M. D.; *The State of Prisons and of Child-Saving Institutions in the Civilized World*, by E. C.

Wines, D. D.; *Homer*, Phaeacian an episode of the *Odyssey* as comprised in the 6th, 7th, 8th, 11th, and 13th books, with introduction, notes and appendix, by Prof. A. C. Merriam; "Ein Feste Burg," in 19 languages, by B. Pick; *Protestant Foreign Missions*, Present State, a Universal Survey, by Theo. Christlieb, D. D., Ph. D., Prof. of Theology and University Preacher, Bonn, Prussia, authorized translation from the German, by David Croom, M. A.

ARTICLE IX.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

Preadamites, or a Demonstration of the Existence of Men before Adam, together with a Study of their Condition, Antiquity, Racial Affinities and Progressive Dispersion over the Earth, with Charts and other Illustrations, by Alexander Winchell, LL. D., Professor of Geology and Palaeontology in the University of Michigan; Author of "Sketches of Creation," "The Doctrine of Evolution," "The Reconciliation of Science and Religion," "A Geological Chart," etc. pp. 500. 1880.

The purpose of this large and attractive volume is well set forth in the title thus given. Its chief design is to prove the existence of men on the earth before Adam. Though this idea has been at different times brought forward by others, Prof. Winchell has so elaborated it and given it such systematic form that the volume may be looked upon as maintaining a new view of the human race. It is a book to make an impression, both by the revolutionary character of its positions and by the earnest ability of the writer. His earnestness, here and there, shows the heat of a polemic discussion. This may be due to the collisions into which he has been drawn through controversies called forth by some earlier publications of his views. This polemic warmth, however, is not suited to inspire confidence in the exact impartiality of his treatment of the subject. For with the utmost honesty, and without at all meaning it, writers become biased and one-sided through the conflicts of controversy.

The views here put forward will doubtless attract considerable attention, especially among such as feel an interest in anthropological and Biblical discussions. Only a brief statement of them can be given in this notice. The central idea of the whole work is preadamitism, and all other views presented are subsidiary or collateral. It is maintained that the Biblical Adam, instead of being the first human being, was simply the progenitor of the particular race whose history was meant to be brought into the purview of the sacred narratives and concerned in the development of the scheme of revelation; that this is the conception in which we are to understand all that the writer of *Genesis* and other sacred writers after him

say of Adam and his relations to the race. The support of this position is brought from ethnological facts and the statements of Scripture. Prof. Winchell maintains that in the migrations of the descendants of Noah after the flood, in their Hamitic, Semitic, and Japhetic dispersions, they found in every direction a population of men before them. In summing up the results of inquiry on this point, as to Asia, he says: "From many and various indications, therefore, it appears that the greater part of the continent of Asia has been overspread by a primitive Mongolian race, of which the historical and now dominant races—not less the Chinese and Japanese than the Noachites—are the successors." As to Africa: "Evidences exist of a pre-Hamitic population in the valley of the Nile. The Egyptian language is neither Hamitic nor Semitic. It is regarded by some as representing a transition from Turanian to Semitic." In regard to Europe he says: "History, tradition, linguistics and ethnology conspire to fortify the conclusion that in prehistoric times all Europe was overspread by the Mongoloid race, of which remnants have survived to our times in the persons of the Basques, Finns, Esths, Lapps, and some smaller tribes." These, he claims, are all pre-Noachites. Confirmation of this claim is sought in the study of human skulls of the prehistoric period, and especially in the demands of chronology which allows no sufficient time to account for these wide dispersions of men between the deluge and the date at which such peoples are found. "The descendants of Noah found them in every new country, and could give no account of their origin. They were in existence at an epoch too remote to allow the suggestion of a postdiluvian origin. They belong to a different race from the posterity of Noah." As a corollary of this, the deluge is viewed as not universal or as not destroying all human beings, but only all the people that fell within the purview of Semitic history and tradition; and no difficulty should be felt if it be found that the Brown races, as for instance the Chinese, should be found to run back to a period more remote than the accepted epoch of the flood.

In like way, Prof. Winchell, pursuing the line of regressive investigation, maintains that the Bible implies and develops the existence of other men before and in the days of Adam. He finds it in Cain's fear that some one might slay him, in his going eastward of Eden and marrying, his building a city, in the marriage of Seth, in Lamech's polygamy, in the marriage of the "Sons of God" with "the daughters of men," &c. The narration is looked upon as implying the existence of other people at the time of Adam who is put down as probably springing from the Dravidian race. The Black races certainly, and the Brown races probably, are all to be accounted as pre-Adamic. This point, too, is thought to be sustained by chronological necessities and by both physiological and psychical characteristics of the races.

Prof. Winchell defends his position as involving no theological relations or consequences inconsistent with the Christian system, and asserts that it does not exclude the current conception of Adamic creation, or the

specific unity of the race, and leaves all the facts concerning the atonement and salvation untouched.

We cannot regard Prof. Winchell's proposed "demonstration" as accomplished. Though he reasons earnestly and believes his conclusions, in the main, as sure to be established, these conclusions will certainly have to wait on more assured Biblical interpretation and more established historical and scientific data than he has presented us in this volume. He has been far too ready to give to some widely circulated opinions in speculative science the character of settled and final truth. Many of the data from which he argues are drawn from departments of inquiry in which investigation has just begun its work, and in which little has as yet been settled. This is so whether the data are drawn from chronology, philology, or ethnology. Anthropologists are by no means agreed as to the classification of the races. Philologists are waiting for further light before settling even the question of the original unity or diversity of human language. Dr. Winchell himself, as is easy to do, puts the chronologists to fight among themselves, and shows the distressing confusion that appears in their periods; and yet it is largely on this shifting quicksand that he rests some of his conclusions. He has proceeded too much on the dangerous principle which he, in one place, asserts to be valid—"to base conclusions on facts which we *expect* to discover." There is entirely too much of this kind of conclusion put forth in these days, and there will necessarily be much waiting in vain for the expected facts. The author's zeal for his views has apparently led him sometimes to forget his own statements and unconsciously throw his facts in conflicting bearings. On p. 153, he asserts of the Mongoloid and Mediterranean races: "They manifest socially a total repugnance to each other. We do not discover the least tendency to coalesce. Their racial distinctness has been equally great from the remotest historical times." And yet, in many pages both before and after, he both quotes others and speaks himself of the mixture and blending or amalgamation of these races. The Mongoloids "have infused their blood into a third of the populations of Europe," p. 154. "The tribes of Madagascar are a recognized Malay race, mixed with Negroes and Arabs," p. 238. Indeed he represents the Hamitic and Negro blood as mixed in many of the African tribes, p. 239.

Though not an essential feature of it, Prof. Winchell's view is developed in accordance with the hypothesis of evolution and the derivative theory of specific origins and much of his reasoning rests upon them. As to the antiquity of man, he believes that the pre-Adamites were geologically preglacial, and their origin may reach back perhaps a hundred thousand years, but that prehistoric Europeans were postglacial and their antiquity cannot be carried, on archaeological and ethnological grounds, beyond 5,000 or 6,000 B. C. He deals very severely with the data which many scientists have accepted as proofs of an immense antiquity for fossil man in Europe.

The Spell-bound Fiddler: A Norse Romance. By Kristofer Janson. Translated from the original by Auber Forestier. With an Introduction by Rasmus B. Anderson. pp. 161. 1880.

This is one of the latest works of the Norwegian, Kristofer Janson, who is now visiting his countrymen in our northwestern States. The author is "one of the most noted poets, novelists and public speakers of Norway," and is using all his energies towards establishing an independent and national language in his native land. The introduction by Mr. Anderson occupies about fifty pages and is largely historical and biographical. The short story itself is about Torgeir, the "Miller Boy," a most skillful violinist, many of whose compositions have been published, having been written, while he was playing them, by Ole Bull and other Norse musicians. The prejudice still existing in Norway against the violin and secular music is gradually weakening, and this book, if widely read there, will do much towards causing it to disappear. The attachment of Torgeir for his fiddle is, in many instances, touching, and the influence it had on him and his audience while playing is wonderful. The story is interesting and gives a very satisfactory view of Norse life, manners and prejudices—especially in the line of the pleasures connected with the kind of music spoken of throughout the book.

ANSON D. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

The Gospel Miracles in their Relation to Christ and Christianity. By Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York. pp. 249.

We desire to recommend this book. It consists of seven lectures, on "the L. P. Stone foundation," before the students of Princeton Theological Seminary, this last winter. The lectures discuss the Nature and Possibility of Miracles, the Supernatural in Christ, the Credibility of Miracles, the Testimony for them, the Mythical Theory, the Evidential Value of Miracles, and their Spiritual Significance. They, therefore, cover in brief way the chief questions that modern skeptical thought has raised on this subject. The field is one in which we can look for little that is new, but Dr. Taylor's mind works vigorously and freshly in presenting the truth as developed and emphasized in the best recent discussions. With his clear and strong mental grasp of the subject and his style so terse and direct, he has given us a volume of much interest and value. It is quickening and assuring to Christian faith. Books like this should go into the hands of the people. In these days of infidel activity in popularizing skeptical teachings and thrusting them into men's minds, such books as this ought to be put into every reading Christian family.

The author has done well to add, in the Appendix, his letter to the New York *Tribune* on Huxley's lectures on evolution in that city four years ago. It was one of the best exposures of the bad logic of those lectures, and worthy of preservation in this permanent form.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

The Reader's Handbook of Allusions, References, Plots, and Stories, with two Appendices. By the Rev. E. Cobham Brewer, LL. D., Trinity Hall, Cambridge, author of "Dictionary of Phrase and Fable," and "Guide to Science." pp. 1170. 1880.

This volume belongs to the class of useful books. It is meant to supply readers and speakers with a lucid, but brief account of such names and words as occur in allusions and references found either in poetic or prose literature, and to furnish the plots of dramas and popular tales, and the stories of epic and other poems. It is just the book that has been needed. The amount of ready information here supplied is immense, and of the highest value to the general reader of our English literature. When we once get possession of such a work—a thesaurus of such varied and needed information—we wonder how we ever could have done without it. It is impossible, in a brief space, to give an adequate conception of the comprehensive scope and variety of the words, phrases, allusions, legends, stories, literary characters, &c., concerning which the author has thus presented a short but helpful account.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

Old Faiths in New Light. By Newman Smyth. 12mo. pp. 391. 1879.

Mr. Smyth's book belongs to the department of Apologetics; not however to that class of works which treat of Christianity as though it were something for which apologies must be made in the popular sense of that word. Mr. Smyth does not think it necessary to apologize for the hope that is in him. Christianity to his mind justifies itself to thought; to the deepest thought; and as the course of human thinking deepens and widens with the access of new knowledge, that justification becomes more profound, more completely satisfying. The book before us is the endeavor to show how as man's thought of the universe deepens and grows richer, the revelation of Scripture with equal progress deepens its meaning and grows more profoundly true.

To characterize his work as briefly as possible, we may call it the application of the idea of evolution to Divine Revelation. Whatever we may think of the varying theories of evolution that are struggling to establish themselves as true, it will hardly be doubted that the doctrine that the universe has come to be what it is by a process of development, is now firmly established as a settled belief. Very few thinkers believe any more that all the forms of life were made what they are by an instantaneous act of creation from nothing; there has been an ascent, an unfolding, a passing from the less to the more perfect. That, we say, is the idea of the creation of the universe which now possesses the human mind. This idea our author applies to the discussion of the truth of revealed religion.

He shows first that the revelation of the Scriptures were given historically, not by a single act of supernatural communication from heaven to men, but by a succession of divine manifestations stretching through long periods of time; and that these revelations were not made in an isolated way, as, for instance, in the revelation professed to be given to Mahomet, in which the whole communication was made to one man and apart from any special occasion or particular history. On the contrary, the revelation of the Bible comes, not only through many different and far separated minds, each advancing a step beyond his predecessor, but through the unfolding progress of a nation's history, so that each item and step of the revelation is part and instrument of that historical progress and development. It is Israel that reveals God, Israel and its history, as well as Moses and David and Isaiah.

He shows also that revelation has been a progressive moral education of mankind; that each great doctrine has been unfolded gradually through the progress of revelation just as man has become capable of receiving it. This is illustrated by the rise and growth of the names of God in the Old Testament; by the growth and unfolding of the doctrine of sacrifice; by the gradual growth of the hope of immortality. In all these evidence is found, in the course of revelation, of a supernatural evolution.

All this, however, is more or less old ground; those lines of thought have been opened before. But now we come to a section in which our author strikes out in a new path. He proposes to show that the same educational method is followed in the scientific teaching of the Bible. He refuses to take refuge in the convenient evasion of the difficulty that the Bible does not undertake to teach science. Some science, he says, it does teach; it tells us of the creation of the world; and in doing that it evinces its deep educational truth. He then proceeds to make what we cannot refuse to consider as good points on this subject: that the biblical view of nature is utterly free from mythology and all nature-myths; that it has a clear conception of the reign of law; that it affirms the spiritual origin of all material phenomena; that it specially singles out the divine acts in the origination of matter, life and soul, as defining the three great divisions of existence; and that it reveals the fact of a continuous creative process, and so implies a law of development. Here, says, our author is the ground-work of science, to be built upon, to be expanded and filled up in detail as man shall master the language of the stars and the strata, but never to be altered or found false. It is an outline map sketched on the thumb-nail, a mnemonic alphabet of science.

Then he passes to the advent of Christ: in the uniqueness of that historical figure, which he treats of in its moral features at some length, and in the naturalness of his history combined, he finds an irrefutable argument for the truth of revelation. That one so transcending all that had gone before, and yet fulfilling all the wishes, aspirations, moral prophecies and tendencies of the race, and specially of Israel up to that time, should

come into the world and reveal in Himself the next step in the progress of a moral kingdom, is to our author a truth of supernatural evolution. Christ is the step by which God has led the race one stage further on in the development of His divine kingdom.

In the unfinished world, so full of problems, failures, incompleteness, he finds a prophecy of the unseen world that is to complete this. And here, too, the Bible, with its revelation of that unseen and eternal state does fit in to the prophecy and hope that the heart makes for the future.

The last chapter treats of the resurrection as the continuity of the life of the individual. He endeavors to define what the resurrection body is to be; not the material body which the apostle has in view when he says "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God," nor the mere spiritual body which in the Swedenborgian conception is only a finer effervescence of matter;—neither of these, but a change into a new type of existence, "the assimilation by the living energy or soul of the material of the unseen Universe." This is rather vague, as indeed our author confesses, but it shadows forth an idea. Here, we think, is the weakest part of the book: the chain breaks at the last link.

We have tried to outline the author's train of thought. It will be seen to be in some respects original. He acknowledges his obligations to such writers as Dorner, Ewald and Lotze; and he has evidently caught up ideas to weave into his fabric wherever they have come to hand. But by the use he has made of them they become rightly his own. We can commend it as a book of grand power of suggestion; it starts trains of thought on every page that run branching off in all directions. It is a seed-bed of thought.

As for the general line of argument that Divine Revelation is a development keeping step with the history of man, using that history as the organ of its manifestation, growing in definiteness and complexity and richness as the mind it comes to illuminate grows deeper and more perfect, in all this there is a deep truth. The history of man *is* a development, and the revelation of God *is* the pillar of cloud and fire that has gone before it stage by stage over the desert of its travel: if the great discussion of evolution when it has subsided shall leave us no other solid gain than this, it will have done a great service that it has made us see more clearly the wonderful line of advance by which the Bible led first Israel, and then the new Israel, on and on from light to light. But whether all the stages of the progress are those exactly that Mr. Smyth indicates, we cannot yet be sure; perhaps he himself would hesitate to say he has fixed the several periods of the movement. At any rate he has made us feel that there is a line of advance: we see how the great drama unfolds, and we anticipate how it is to go on unfolding.

Mr. Smyth's style is curiously bad: clumsy in structure, slip-shod in movement, and depends for light and impressiveness on certain glaring, sometimes striking figures, that appear as so much distinct ornamentation

laid on after the body of the work was finished. If we might be allowed to say so, we are conscious of a flavor of the flamboyant manner of Joseph Cook. But Mr. Smyth will say, 'the thought is weighty enough to carry the style and its imperfections with it.' Well, perhaps it is; but it is just that inequality and awkwardness which robs Mr. Smyth's work of greatness. Such thoughts ought to impress one with the grand air; but they do not. The thoughts are great and rich; but somehow after Mr. Smyth has uttered them they do not seem great at all until we have disengaged them from his words and taken them out of sight of him; then they are great once more. It is a bad thing when a writer handles great matter in such a way that he and it leave the impression of pettiness. It is just the opposite of what Boswell, or was it Goldsmith, said of Dr. Johnson: "Doctor," said his admirer, "you make your little minnows talk like little whales." Mr. Smyth unfortunately makes his whales talk like little minnows.

C. A. S.

The Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt. By P. Le Page Renouf. (The Hibbert Lectures for 1879). pp. 270. 1880.

This scholarly volume is published without preface, or any other word of explanation than that which marks it on the title page as "Hibbert Lectures for 1879." But this will itself need explanation to a large number of readers. For the public has not yet become familiar with the Hibbert foundation. For though the fund that supports it was bequeathed in 1849 for purposes "most conducive to the spread of Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form, and to the unfettered exercise of private judgment in matters of religion," the Trustees, who were freely allowed to decide on the method of accomplishing this design, and for many years appropriated the funds almost entirely to the higher culture of students for the Christian ministry, inaugurated this lectureship only in 1878. This was done at the petition of Dr. James Martineau, Dean Stanley, Max Müller, Wm. B. Carpenter, M. D., Dr. Tulloch, and others, who allege that theological inquiries and discussions are "under traditional restraint" in all the chief divinity schools of England. The lectureship is, therefore, under the auspices of those who seem to feel that the truth can best be found in breaking over the lines of accepted orthodoxy, but who maintain a pledged devotion to Christianity. The first series of lectures was delivered by Prof. Max Müller on the "Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the Religions of India," and they constitute a volume of high value. For the second series, the Trustees secured the services of M. le Page Renouf, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, whose lectures are given in the book before us.

M. Renouf has given us a volume of much interest on a subject that is attracting increased attention among scholars. He first traces the sources of information respecting the ancient Egyptian religion. He cautions against accepting the notions of it found in ancient writers of other nations,

who have presented it in terms that degrade it very deeply; and reminds us how even Christianity has been falsely defamed by some pagan writers of high name. The antiquity and characteristics of Egyptian civilization are discussed in the second lecture. Some of the author's data for fixing the prehistoric antiquity of the human race in that country, are much more uncertain than he counts them to be. This is followed by an inquiry into the gods of the Egyptians, their communion with the unseen world, their religious books, their hymns, henotheism, pantheism and materialism.

The author shows that their multitudinous polytheism consists rather in a multiplication of *names* than of gods. "The whole mythology of Egypt may be said to turn upon the histories of Ra and Osiris, and these histories, run into each other, sometimes in inextricable confusion, which ceases to be wonderful when texts are discovered which simply identify Osiris and Ra. And, finally, other texts are known, wherein Ra, Osiris, Amon and all other gods disappeared, except as *names*, and the unity of God is asserted in the noblest language of monotheistic religion." He explains their gods as but mythical personifications of the powers and forces of nature as manifestations of one everliving, active Intelligence. "The gods of Egypt are the 'mighty ones,' the forces acting throughout the universe, in heaven and on earth, according to fixed and unchangeable laws, forever and forever." Mr. Renouf believes that the early form of Egyptian religion was not Fetichism, nor "propitiation of dead ancestors," nor Polytheism, but Monotheism of partheistic conception. "The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, heathen or Christian, was by far the grossest and most corrupt." It included the doctrine of a future existence. "The word *anchiu*, which literally signifies the 'living,' is in innumerable places used emphatically for the 'departed,' who are enjoying an everlasting life."

In his statement that the opinion which holds Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch "must assuredly be abandoned," Renouf does not represent the judgment of the best critical scholarship. There are some other views from which many will dissent. But he has given us a volume of discussion that will help toward a right understanding of the religion of the wonderful people whose beliefs it investigates.

The Saviour's Converts. What we owe to them, and How we may aid them. By the Rev. William Scribner, author of "Pray for the Holy Spirit," "These Little Ones," etc. pp. 174. 1880.

This is an earnest plea for intelligent and faithful effort on the part of Christians to encourage and help those who are entering the Church or beginning the life of faith. The nature of conversion, the considerations that should stimulate endeavor to aid new believers, the doctrinal truths most serviceable for them, their difficulties, duties, privileges and proper activities, are presented clearly and impressively. The last chapter, on catechization, presents a point of special importance.

Discussions in History and Theology, by George P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. pp. 555. 1880.

It seems superfluous to commend a volume from the pen of Dr. Fisher. His works have made him so well and favorably known that his name itself attracts attention for whatever he publishes. As an independent and vigorous thinker, he is among the foremost of our American historico-theological writers.

The volume before us, though of somewhat diversified contents, is composed of discussions which are in the line of the author's best abilities. They are ripe fruit from ground he has most thoroughly cultivated. Sixteen essays are given, collected from the *New Englander*, *Princeton Review*, and other journals in which they first appeared; and all of them are worthy of preservation and enlarged circulation in this permanent form. With several exceptions they fall into three groups. The first group, beginning with the second paper, consists of discussions of the history, polity and dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, especially in view of the new aspects of the papacy under its loss of temporal power and as its rights and jurisdiction have been settled by the conciliar decree of infallibility. The second group of essays relates to New England theology and the modifications of Calvinistic philosophy involved in it. The third division pertains to Theism and Christian evidences. Besides the papers included in these groups, there is an essay on the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve, one giving an historical view of the Doctrine of Future Punishment, and another presenting the Relations of the Church of England to other Protestant bodies. The volume thus includes an exposition of some of the most important of recent movements in theological thought, and discusses some of the most interesting of the living questions of the day. The paper on the Old Roman spirit and Religion in Latin Christianity, is full of truth that needs to be considered in estimating the forms of our modern church life. Though but incidentally discussed, the views presented on Christian symbolism and art are at once so philosophical and healthy as to commend themselves strongly to all who are seeking correct principles on that subject. We are glad to see the brief "Review of 'Supernatural Religion,'" first published in the *New York Independent*, included in the volume. Though short, it is a sufficient reply to the extended work which it criticises.

The Life and Writings of St. John, by James M. Macdonald, D. D., Princeton, New Jersey. Edited with an introduction by the Very Reverend J. S. Howson, D. D., Dean of Chester. pp. xxxvi.; 436. 1880.

As soon as students of the Bible had learned the value of Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," there was felt a general and urgent desire that some one competent for the task should furnish a similar volume on the life and writings of St. John. This desire has been met

in the present volume of Dr. James M. Macdonald, late of Princeton, N. J., a fitting companion to the "Life and Epistles of Paul," one of whose authors, Dean Howson, has written an excellent introduction to the work and has edited it, the author having died while its pages were passing through the press.

It is doubtless the presence of Dr. Howson in our country at this time, that stimulated the publishers to call attention anew to this estimable volume with which the name of this eminent divine is so closely connected, and we are glad of an opportunity of commanding it to the religious public. It must certainly prove a great aid in the study of that most precious part of the Bible which the beloved disciple, who leaned so tenderly upon the Master, and who drank so deeply of His spirit, has bequeathed to the Christian Church.

"The plan" of the work "is to present in one view all parts of St. John's life in their connection with one another and with his writings, and also in their connection with the life of Christ and the founding of His Church."

The method of presenting the personal character and career of a writer in close combination with his writings, has peculiar advantages in profane literature, the exact truth and precise sense, the full bearing of many utterances is thus brought to view with a distinctness, a certainty and a satisfaction which could not possibly be realized, were the readers ignorant of the characteristic personality of the author. In the volumes of inspired literature these advantages are equally obvious and important. So far as we can ascertain the personal history of David and Isaiah, or trace the presence and movements of John and of Paul, there is thrown over all their utterances a stream of light, which gives to them a clearness and a charm of inestimable value to the studious readers of the Bible. It is in fact incomparably more easy and more interesting to get the truth from a living personality, in immediate connection with the well-known history of a fellow-being, than to spell it out from abstract propositions or gather it from sources that are isolated from personal life and inaccessible to our view. This book of Dr. Macdonald will be of service to Pastors, but it will be especially helpful to Sunday School teachers and other intelligent laymen, who ought by all means to have more reading of this kind. The more learned biblical student will likely be disappointed. The author was not a Princeton Professor, but the Pastor of the Princeton Presbyterian church, and he seems to have written not with a view to advance the scientific and critical study of the Scriptures, but to promote a popular knowledge of the sacred authors and their inspired teachings. On that very account the work will be more readable and more profitable to a large class in the Church. Pastors can write better for pastors and lay readers than others who may indeed enter more deeply into Biblical science and conduct the reader through controversial labyrinths of Biblical difficulties, but they very often fail to appreciate the wants, capacities and tastes of those who are most in need of help to Scripture study.

Unlike the similar work of Conybeare and Howson this volume makes no pretense to a revision or improvement of the King James' version. The whole of the Apocalypse, the Epistles and the Gospel are given just as we have them in our English Bibles, with only here and there a suggestion of an improved translation. One might indeed, with propriety ask, what is the use of occupying nearly half the space of 200 octavo pages with a literal copy of the common English text of the New Testament?

The criticism of the original text receives a little more attention. In Jno. 5:7, 8, "in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost," &c., is of course surrendered, "the historical evidence against its genuineness being so conclusive that it is dismissed without further discussion." Jno. 5, last clause of v. 3, to the end of v. 4, "waiting for the water," &c., fares likewise, while with reference to the account of the woman taken in adultery, Jno. 8, the author states: "The evidence for its genuineness seems to outweigh the objections to it."

The foot-notes accompanying the sacred text, in keeping with the evident design of the whole work, are of a popular and practical nature, far from voluminous, and those having a geographical or historical reference are especially valuable.

We have of course no right to look for an acknowledgment of Lutheran doctrine in a production of Presbyterian origin, but it is not often that one sees so monstrous a wresting of Scripture passages from their plain intent, as is witnessed here in the comments on Jno. 3:5: "The Sacrament of Christian Baptism, not then instituted as a Christian rite, cannot be alluded to, though it is understood by Lutherans as well as Romanists. The divine Teacher meant by being born of water that we must be born again by the word of God; in complete harmony with which we find the Apostle Paul, when describing the same great change, saying that we must be sanctified and cleansed "with the washing of water by the word." This last clause accordingly means simply that we are to be cleansed by the washing of the word by the word, which, to say the least, is charging St. Paul with very stupid rhetoric. When the author, further on, verses 16, 17, says with regard to the world, "It is the whole world which God loved, and for which He gave His Son, the only limitation of the gift of everlasting life, through this love of God, is found in the words, 'whosoever believeth in Him,'" it is quite evident that he did not train indiscriminately with the Calvinists. In his exposition of this latter passage he would probably have found himself, as well as the Lutherans, in the company of the Catholics, much more than in harmony with Calvin their most radical assailant.

The question of the authorship of the writings bearing the name of John is barely alluded to. With reference to the Gospel, a single extract from Liddon's Bampton Lectures is made to do duty for the whole controversy on this great subject, but the paragraph is so happy and conclusive that it will serve most readers a better purpose than would an extensive dis-

cussion embracing all the objections and all the arguments for the Johannine authorship.

As to the Apocalypse the internal evidence is relied on as sufficient alone, over against what external evidence there may be to the contrary, to determine not only its canonical character, but the early date of its composition, before the destruction of Jerusalem and during the persecution of Nero. Scenes existing at the time furnish the starting point for the book, and many of these have direct relation to Jerusalem, as still standing, while its destruction was near at hand. According to chap. 6, the temple and altar were still the seat of worship and the greatest woes were yet in store for the devoted city, "which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." In fact while the Seer in his exile under Nero, was having his tremendous visions, "the 1260 days were very soon to commence, and on his lonely rock in the Ægean the banished Apostle could see the lightnings flash, and hear the thunders roll and the trumpets of the armies resound, gathering for the overthrow of the devoted city he loved so well."

LEE & SHEPARD, BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia.

The True Story of the Exodus of Israel, together with a Brief View of the History of Monumental Egypt, compiled from the work of Dr. Henry Brugsch-Bey. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by Francis H. Underwood. pp. 260. 1880.

Dr. Brugsch is a very prominent German Egyptologist, and his long-continued original investigations have gained high consideration for his views. Under the patronage of the Egyptian government, he spent thirty years in exploration and study of monumental inscriptions, mostly in company with the distinguished French *savant*, M. Mariette. This volume contains so much of Dr. Brugsch's "Egypt under the Pharaohs" as concerns the settlement of the family of Jacob and their Exodus as a people under Moses. To enable the reader to understand the historic connection, the editor has made a brief summary of leading events and given an account of the most prominent of the Pharaohs. Some account is given of the early races, of the royal residences, and of the Hyksos, under the last of whom Joseph was the favorite minister. As far as consistent with fluent narration, all these topics are presented in the author's own words.

Dr. Brugsch finds in Egypt the source of written language and of art and architecture. He believes that the Hebrews derived from it most of their religious ideas and rites, and that their sacred literature is modeled, as to tone of thought and style, upon the writings preserved in Egyptian papyrus rolls and temple inscriptions. Though Egyptian history is silent as to the Hebrews and their miraculous escape, the Scripture narrative is found to accord with known events and dates and with the permanent facts of geography. Dr. Brugsch holds that the time of Joseph must have

fallen in the time of the Hypsos' dominion, (the Shepherd Kings), and finds in one of the monuments, at the tomb of Baba, mention of a famine lasting many years, and of the issuing of corn for the necessity, corresponding to the seven years of famine in Joseph's day. But the chief purpose of the book is to present a new view as to the route of the exodus of the Israelites. This is a theory which Dr. Brugsch has adopted from Dr. Unruh and Dr. Schleiden, and which represents the journey of the children of Israel as not at all across the Red Sea, but by a northern way through the Sirbonian bog near the Mediterranean. He believes that the evidence from the geography of the country and the study of the monuments requires a different route from the commonly accepted one through the Red Sea, and claims that the Scripture statements, correctly interpreted, fully agree with this. "Far from lessening the authority and weight of the Books on which our holy religion is founded, the results at which the author of this memoir has arrived, will serve, on the contrary, as testimonies to establish the supreme veracity of the sacred Scriptures."

This theory, however, though supported recently by Prof. Sayce, of Oxford, is not likely to be sustained. Discussion of it, since this volume has appeared, has already gone far to show its untenability. The theory rests essentially on the "identification of Ramses, Pithom, Succoth and other places in Goshen," but this identification is not fully accepted by able Egyptologists. The argument for the new route, from *Yam Suph* as meaning "sea of marsh-reeds," is valueless. The rendering "Red Sea," as in our authorized version of the Bible, is sustained by abundant evidence that in ancient times, if not now, sea-weeds were found on its shores, and by the various connections which show that *yam suph* must undoubtedly be the Red Sea. In Num. 33:10, for instance, it is said: "They removed from Elim and encamped by the Red Sea (*Yam Suph*)."¹ Did the Israelites go back across the isthmus of Suez, from Elim to the Sirbonian bog? Kings 9:26; Num. 21:4, &c., are decisive against Dr. Brugsch's route.

Though the author's theory of the exodus cannot be accepted, this volume is both interesting and instructive, and shows how recent research among the monumental wonders of Egypt has been throwing illustrative light on the records of the Pentateuch.

PHILLIPS & HUNT, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

Commentary on the New Testament. By D. D. Whedon, LL. D., Vol. V. Titus to Revelation. pp. 483. 1880.

This volume completes the valuable *Commentary* of Dr. Whedon on the New Testament. Its general excellence has been more than once acknowledged in this QUARTERLY, and it is gratifying to note that this final volume of the New Testament series falls in no respect below the merits of the four preceding volumes.

The Old Testament portion of this admirable work will consist of eight

volumes, only two of which, vol. III., Joshua to 2 Samuel, and vol. IV., Kings to Esther, have thus far appeared. The other six volumes are announced "in preparation."

On the title page of this volume we read, "Intended for popular use," and on every page Dr. W. gives abundant evidence of his purpose in this respect and of his ability to carry it out. A chief excellence of the work consists in its clear and practical exposition of the divine word. The Bible students who most need the aid of commentaries need as a rule to have something of this kind. And the more "popular" will it prove to the ever-growing body of intelligent Christians. It is indeed high time that American scholarship should contribute more largely to the critical literature and scientific exegesis of the Scriptures, yet with the ever-increasing interest among the laity in Bible study, such commentaries for the people are to be cordially welcomed, especially when coming from a master in this department like Dr. Whedon.

In his "Introduction" to the different Epistles that constitute respectively the subject of this volume, the author is less happy than in his elucidation of the text. He holds, for instance, St. Paul to be the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; a view which, notwithstanding the fact of many elements of likeness and of "close connexion of faith and feeling" with the other writings of the Apostle to the Gentiles, is now regarded by a majority of the ablest biblical scholars as utterly untenable. Dr. W. must himself have been at one time close on to that conviction, and must even now feel hard pressed to maintain a contrary position, else how are we to account for his desperate recourse to an ingenious suggestion of the fanciful Delitzsch in order to prop up Pauline authorship. An insuperable barrier to this theory, it is well known, is the absence of Paul's name from the head of the Epistle. Since, however, each of the Greek words, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, with which the Epistle opens, begins with *pol*, this is interpreted as an intentional "hint of Paul's own name." Thus "Paul's name twice written, does stand occultly at the head of the Epistle; a secret guarantee, perhaps, to his friends, but invisible to the eyes of his opponents!" After that any one refusing to be convinced of the Pauline authorship of this grand epistle must be chargeable with — no lack of honest capacity.

Fragments: Religious and Theological. A Collection of Independent Papers relating to various points of Christian Life and Doctrine. By Daniel Curry. pp. 375. 1880.

This collection of papers has been made by Dr. Curry from the miscellaneous articles he has contributed from time to time to various magazines and reviews. There are nineteen of these articles, and among the subjects are, "Sin a Fact in the Spiritual Cosmos;" "The Doctrine of Condemnation;" "Righteousness through Faith;" "Arminian vs. Calvinian Justification;" "Prayer—Its Nature and Potency;" "Faith and Science;"

"The Humanity of Christ," &c. The author's treatment of these subjects is clear and interesting, and we take little exception to the views expressed. The line drawn between justification and sanctification is much more clearly marked than we usually find in the writings of Methodist divines, and the two papers on "Faith and Science" will be found of special value. All the papers are suggestive, and the volume, although made up of "fragments" covering many years, is in line with the fresh thought of to-day.

Dio the Athenian; or from Olympus to Calvary. By Rev. E. F. Burr, D. D., author of "Ecce Caelum," "Pater Mundi," etc. Four Illustrations. pp. 498. 1880.

Dr. Burr, in the Preface, states his purpose in writing this volume, as follows: "The object of this work is to illustrate the natural progress of a cultivated Greek of the first century from the best form of classical paganism, through the various philosophical schools most akin to those of our time, to theoretical and practical Christianity." The author skillfully transfers the reader to the Athens of eighteen centuries ago, places him among the scenes and reveals to him the character and general line of thought of the Athenians of that period, and gives him a view of their worship and sacrifices to their gods. We get a better view than we have ever had of the newsy and gossipy character of the "agora," where the people "spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or hear some new thing," Acts 17:21. The "agora" was the substitute for the newspaper of the present day. Dio, before he was twenty years of age, spent some time in the Roman army, and during that period had his faith in the Grecian gods weakened and began to question their power, etc. He learns of the God of the Hebrews, and eventually attains to faith in Him and the Saviour whom Paul on Mars' Hill declared should "judge the world in righteousness." On pages 239-244 will be found a discussion, between Dio and an Athenian philosopher, on a phase of materialism, revealing views much like those held in our day. The father of Dio is Dionysius the Areopagite of Acts xvii., and Damaris of the same chapter becomes betrothed to Dio. Their relations to each other give the book somewhat the nature of a novel, but the whole drift of the volume is much higher and will be found very attractive to the intelligent Christian reader who has an acquaintance with classical literature.

A Concordance to the Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to which are added several important Indexes. By William Codville, member of the Faculty of the McKeesport (Pa.) Academy. pp. 205. 1880.

We are not aware that a complete Concordance to a Hymnal, such as that here given of the Methodist Book, has ever been published before. The author has done for the Hymnal what Cruden did for the Bible. It must have cost an immense amount of labor, but it will certainly prove a very great convenience to the ministers of the Methodist Church.

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

| Article. | Page. |
|--|-------|
| I. HUMAN ORDINANCES IN THE CHURCH,..... | 316 |
| By REV. S. A. HOLMAN, A. M., Philadelphia, Pa. | |
| II. CHURCH DISCIPLINE..... | 362 |
| By GEO. DIEHL, D. D., Frederick, Md. | |
| III. THE COLLEGE,..... | 376 |
| By REV. CHAS. S. ALBERT, A. M., Carlisle, Pa. | |
| IV. SOME OF THE PRIVATE COLLOQUIES AND PUBLIC DISPUTATIONS OF LUTHER,..... | 386 |
| By JOHN G. MORRIS, D. D., LL. D., Baltimore, Md. | |
| V. THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF OLD TESTAMENT MIRACLES,..... | 422 |
| By Rev. Dr. GEORGE H. SCHODDE, Martins Ferry, Ohio. | |
| VI. THE PRACTICAL RELIGION OF THE HINDUS,..... | 432 |
| By REV. A. D. ROWE, Guntur, India. | |
| VII. THE PALATINE PARISH BY QUASSAICK,..... | 438 |
| By REV. WILLIAM HULL, Hudson, N. Y. | |

VIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,..... 455

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Miscellaneous.

IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... 457

Pre-Adamites—The Spell-bound Fiddler—The Gospel Miracles in their Relation to Christ and Christianity—The Reader's Handbook of Allusions References, Plots, and Stories—The Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt—The Saviour's Converts—Discussions in History and Theology—The Life and Writings of St. John—The True Story of the Exodus of Israel—Commentary on the New Testament—Fragments, Religious and Theological—Dio the Athenian—A Concordance to the Hymnal of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The four Foreign Quarterlies, the *Edinburgh Review*, the *London Quarterly*, the *Westminster*, and the *British Quarterly*, with *Blackwood*, from the Leonard Scott Publishing Co., have been received, filled with able and valuable discussions.

Harper's *Magazine*, *Bazar*, and *Weekly* have also come regularly to hand, and fully sustain their high reputation.

Some Book Notices have been unexpectedly crowded out of this number. They will appear in the next.